NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCLII.

MARCH, 1886.

THE FISHERY QUESTION.

ONCE more, for the seventh time since our history as a nation began, the fishery question is before us for solution. In 1783 the first grant of fishing privileges in Canadian waters was secured, though not without endangering the treaty of peace with Great Britain. After the war of 1812 it was found impossible to obtain the revival of these privileges, and it was not until 1818 that our fishery relations with Great Britain were put on a permanent footing. By the treaty of 1818 the United States consented to a very serious limitation of the rights which they had formerly enjoyed.

Between 1836 and 1851 came the movement of the Provinces to limit the concessions of the treaty of 1818 by a new construction of the three-mile limit, and the passage of certain harassing laws by their legislatures.

In 1854 the Reciprocity Treaty was signed which gave our fishermen the right to fish in waters previously closed to them, but at the price of free entry of Canadian lumber, fish, and certain other products. This arrangement was allowed to terminate in 1865, and, six years later, came a new form of reciprocity under the Treaty of Washington in 1871, the same treaty which provided for the settlement of the Alabama claims. This granted free fishing on the one side and the free entry of fish on the other, but with a provision for striking a balance between the money values of the privileges which each country had received.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In midsummer last this, in turn expired, and after consenting to a temporary extension of the treaty to avoid breaking in upon the fishing season, the administration is now face to face with the fishery question once more.

Is a permanent solution practicable?

For a long time past it has been the policy of maritime states to build up their fisheries in various ways. They were a useful industry, furnishing a cheap and valuable food product, and forming a convenient reservoir for seamen in case of war. Thus by the comity of states, coast fishermen have long been exempted from the operations of naval warfare, from the capture and condemnation as enemy's property to which even yet the mercantile marine is subject. This policy the United States have imitated. Until 1854 they have consistently tried to protect and foster the coast fisheries at the national expense. In the treaty of 1783, for example, the free navigation of the Mississippi was granted as an equivalent for the right to fish in provincial waters. In 1799 a bounty of thirty cents per barrel was granted on all exports of pickled fish. In 1813 the cod-fishermen received a tonnage bounty under conditions. For bankers of over thirty tons this was four dollars per ton. In 1819 this was increased for smaller craft, and in 1846 a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* was laid on all imports of fish. Finally, in one of the protocols to the Treaty of Washington, a million dollars were offered for the right to fish in Canadian waters, not otherwise opened, in perpetuity. Under the stimulus of these bounties and duties the tonnage employed in the coast fisheries rapidly increased. On the whole, the thirty or forty years following 1818 were prosperous ones for New England fishermen in spite of somewhat frequent collisions between them and the provincial officials. Our fishermen were often tempted to smuggle; they could not be always kept from fishing in waters not opened to them by treaty; serious misunderstanding arose over the three-mile limit inside which they could not fish, and how it was to be measured. Many American smacks were seized on suspicion, some confiscated, some rescued by their crews, some discharged, but without chance of damages for illegal detention. Both parties to the treaty grew dissatisfied, a new arrangement was desired, and the treaty of 1854 was the result. Then, for the first time, our fishermen paid for enlarged fishery rights, as it were, out of their own pockets. For, though they had a wider range for their fishing,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they lost the protected market for their fish. More than this, the Reciprocity Treaty built up formidable competition in Canadian waters. Under the old system the provincial fishermen were in bondage to the traders who supplied their outfits. But, soon, with the American market for their catch, and with a demand on the spot for their provisions, bait, wood, and other articles, they were able to own their boats. We are now told that, under the similar working of the 1871 arrangement, they are outgrowing their boats, and own many fishing-smacks. The treaty of 1854 seems to have been allowed to expire at the wish of our fishermen. Probably the immediate effects of the Reciprocity Treaty outweighed in their minds the possible evils of a return to the basis of the treaty of 1818. For the next four years our experiment was tried by the Canadian Government. A license was charged American smacks of so much per ton, which opened to them the whole inshore fisheries of the Provinces. This was fifty cents the first year, one dollar the next, and two dollars after that. Under the two-dollar arrangement the fourth year but twenty-five vessels were licensed. As the smacks were from fifty to eighty tons burden, this indicates that our fishermen, about 1870, did not consider the Canadian inshore fisheries worth an average of one hundred and fifty dollars apiece to them.

When the license system failed, the Provinces prepared to enforce the rigor of the law, but a new agreement was at hand, and the Home Government moderated their zeal. The new reciprocity treaty of Washington, with its results, is still fresh in our minds.

The most unaccountable and unjust decision of the Halifax Commission awarded a sum of five and one-half millions as the excess of value of the privileges enjoyed by the United States over those granted to Great Britain, in spite of the fact that the entire market value of all fish taken by our fishermen, during the term of the treaty, in treaty-opened waters, did not equal this sum. This again showed the willingness of the Government to aid its fishing interests at the national expense. And this is one point which I wish to emphasize, that except during the first reciprocity treaty, the government has consistently pursued the policy of encouraging the fishing industries in the North-east at the public cost.

An important question now presents itself. Under the working of the reciprocity treaties how have our fishermen fared? As

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters are at present situated are they right in wishing to discontinue all reciprocity arrangements—to return to the basis of the treaty of 1818? And what are their rights under the treaty of 1818? This treaty is by its terms perpetual, and is the foundation upon which all other agreements have been built. It granted the right to fish along the northern, the western, and part of the southern coasts of Newfoundland; off the Labrador coast from Anticosti indefinitely northward, and along the shores of the Magdalen Islands. For shelter and the purchase of wood and water only, were American fishermen to have access elsewhere. Certain rights of landing and drying fish were also granted, but these are no longer valuable, as fish are now differently cured and handled. Besides this they have, of course, the high-sea fisheries, which are free to all men, and which include the greater portion of the cod and halibut and two-thirds of the mackerel catch. Some few herring have been caught off Grand Manan, some cod-fish bait like capelin in the bays of Newfoundland, and a few cod and halibut there and in other places. But it is principally the mackerel inshore fishing in the autumn along the coasts of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Canada, and this alone, that the reciprocity treaties have opened to us. This was once of considerable value. The mackerel men met the incoming shoals off the Atlantic coast from New Jersey to the capes, in the spring. A little later they followed them up to Block Island, Cape Cod, and the Massachusetts Bay. The Maine coast was a favorite ground, and many vessels went no farther eastward. But the majority sailed past the Nova Scotia coast, through the Gut of Canso, and spent the late summer in the Bay of St. Lawrence, fishing broad. Not until autumn did they avail themselves of the treaty-opened waters, particularly in the bight of the bay of Prince Edward Island and off Margaree, where mackerel were found close in, in large quantities.

But now two things have combined to make this late inshore mackerel fishing of little value. For a number of years, after 1876, the mackerel seem to have deserted those waters. They are a capricious fish, very uncertain in their appearance and movements, sometimes swarming in vast numbers along certain coasts, and then for years deserting them almost altogether. Now they are frequenting the Bay of St. Lawrence again but, during 1878, '79, '80 and '81, the bay fishing was a failure. And, secondly, the introduction of the purse-seine has completely changed the fishermen's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

programme. All attempts to use the purse-seine in the gulfs have proved failures, with few exceptions, so that, since 1870, our mackerel men have confined their operations more and more to our own shores.

In 1873, 254 fishing vessels caught 77,011 barrels of packed mackerel in Canadian waters, of which 25,670 came from within the three mile limit.

In 1877, 60 vessels caught 7,319 barrels, and in 1882 one vessel caught 275 barrels, of which not over 100 barrels came from waters opened by the Reciprocity Treaty. The value of these 100 barrels was $2,337.50. The amount paid for the privilege of catching them $458,333, besides the remission of duty at one cent per pound on many million pounds of Canadian fish. These striking figures * prove how little use our fishermen make of the privileges bought for them by the Treaty of Washington. They show sufficiently one reason why they believe a further resort to reciprocity undesirable. But, in their view, there is another and a stronger reason. The remission of duty on Canadian fish has built up a powerful competition in the Provinces, and lowers the profits on their own catch.

In 1869, during the interval between the reciprocity treaties, the "Halifax Chronicle" said: "From the making of the reciprocity treaty until the abrogation, Nova Scotia increased in wealth and population at a most extraordinary rate ; from its abrogation until the present, we have retrograded with the most frightful rapidity. Want of a good market has depreciated the value of our coal mines ; has nearly pauperized our fishermen, farmers and miners, and should this want not be supplied in the only way it can be, by a new treaty with the United States, Nova Scotia will in five years be one of the least desirable countries to live in on this continent." †

Between 1850 and 1870, for example, the settlements along the Gut of Canso were greatly prospered; the small traders made their fortunes ; the farmer-fishermen flourished. When, owing to the introduction of the purse-seine, Americans no longer resorted there, the settlements became deserted. The traders moved away and the wharves are rotting down. This is a single illustration of the value to the Provinces of the American trade at their own doors,

* "Report of U. S. Fish Commission, 1881," page 520.
† Quoted in Cape Ann "Advertiser" of July 2, 1869.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and of the free American market for their fish. Their mackerel fishery was created by the treaty of 1854, and since 1873 their exports of pickled mackerel to the United States have averaged 75,000 barrels, about one-quarter of our entire consumption. Their fishing capital in boats and vessels, their enterprise, and their power of competition, have all largely increased in the mackerel and in other fisheries.

The articles in provincial newspapers, the speeches of Canadian politicians, the demands of their diplomacy, all prove the same thing: the vast importance to them of a free American market for fish. That Canadian competition and the removal of the duty lowered the price of fish and the profits of our fishermen hardly needs demonstration. Canadian competition means larger imports; shortly after the treaty of 1871 took effect, one-quarter larger; in 1880 more than twice as large as the average during the interval between the reciprocity treaties when duty was on. This larger supply means lower prices than would otherwise have obtained.

The remission of a duty of one cent per pound also lowers prices; not by one cent but by a fraction of a cent, according to the amount imported. Mackerel averaged fifty-five cents per barrel lower during the reciprocity treaties than during the interval between them.* In view of facts such as these, can there be any reasonable doubt that, with the fisheries conducted as at present, reciprocity inflicts a serious pecuniary damage upon our fishing industries? Can there be any doubt that the Canadians are deriving great profit from it? Our fishermen naturally protest against the renewal of a reciprocity arrangement. The Canadian fishermen are eagerly desirous of one.

Now, does it follow from all this that no fishery arrangement with Great Britain is desirable? Can we simply fall back upon the treaty of 1818, and declare that we want nothing more? I do not think so.

The uncertain nature and habits of the mackerel have been already alluded to. They have completely deserted the Bay of Fundy. For years they were scarce throughout the whole Gulf of Newfoundland; meanwhile, they became plentiful off the coast of Maine. But no one can predict how long this state of things will continue. In a few years the situation may be entirely changed.

* Documents, Halifax Commission Award.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The mackerel may abandon our own shores and swarm again in the Gulf. Already they are growing more plentiful there. Five years hence our fishermen may clamor for the privileges which they now despise. And again, there are signs that the purse-seine may be discarded. The mackerel-men may return to the old-fashioned hook fishing, or to jigging. The purse-seine is vastly destructive of fish; large and small of all qualities being captured together. Not a year has gone by since 1870 without protests against its use. Thus, in 1878, a delegation of fishermen from Portland and Gloucester went to Washington to secure the passage of a law prohibiting the use of the purse-seine in the mackerel fishery. If this should take place, we must again resort to Canadian waters, for hook fishing works there better than on our own coast.

What *does* follow, is that reciprocity is no longer wise or admissible. It is reciprocity only in name. What we grant the Canadians is of constant and great value. What they grant us is of fluctuating and doubtful value. And this is the third point upon which I should insist: that free fishing and the free entry of fish should no longer be coupled together. They have no necessary relation. The one was taken simply as the most convenient diplomatic equivalent for the other. With our present knowledge, to balance one against the other is a sheer speculation and likely to be a losing one. Let each question be argued on its own merits. Shall we secure the opening of all Canadian waters for our fishermen? I believe that a wise and statesman-like foresight demands this. Nothing is more foolish than to argue that because we do not need it now, we shall never need it. A change in the habits of the fish, or a change in the methods of the fishermen, would make it indispensable; and both are possible. If we rely on the treaty of 1818 alone, when our smacks resort again to the Gulf, we shall at once have a repetition of the difficulties and controversies which marked the old order of things. Arbitrary arrests; armed resistance; the question of the three-mile limit; the right to navigate the Gut of Canso; the right of transshipment; bitter feeling; cruisers confronting each other; unpleasant diplomatic struggles; all these rise up from the past to witness against it. How shall we secure the opening of Canadian waters? I reply, *by the payment of a lump sum for the right to fish in perpetuity.* This was tried in 1871. It is in accordance with the precedents of our past history. It would open forever privileges which may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

become of very great value. It would solve the fishery question finally. It would heal a long open sore. This is a good time to buy, when what our neighbors have to sell seems worthless. They need the trade of our fishermen. It is a wise policy for them to encourage this without equivalent. They could well afford to open to us their waters simply for the traffic our vessels would bring. Matters have changed since 1871. The refusal of a million for this privilege then does not imply the refusal of half that sum now.

With all waters opened to our fishermen, they can compete on favorable terms with all rivals, and enable us to approach our second inquiry with less restraint.

Hitherto we have regarded solely the interests of our fisheries. When we ask if a duty shall be laid on foreign fish, however, it affects the nation at large. This is purely an internal question, and our inquiry might properly end here. But the statement of this second question may be of interest. It is this—Shall we protect the fishermen's market by a duty on all foreign fish, and raise the average value of their catch at the expense of the fish-eating population? This is a tax on the food of the poor. It is not a heavy tax. Duty free, Canadian imports of fish bear a comparatively small proportion to our whole consumption; of mackerel, one-fourth, of other fish, less. Our lake fisheries, and those along the Southern coast, are growing, free from competition. The consumption of fresh fish has largely increased, owing to quicker transportation and better packing, so that salted fish is relatively less valuable. This modifies but does not change the question.

Having bought for our fishermen enlarged fishery rights, is it necessary to maintain for them a protected market? The conditions of this problem may change, and, if we leave ourselves free, we may change our policy from time to time, but may leave it a purely internal question. But with reciprocity—giving free entry of fish for the free rights of fishing—we make it an affair of foreign policy; we give up our liberty of action, and tie our hands for years.

THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPHY.

It appears to me that the time has arrived when the Government of the United States should purchase, in the interest of the people, all the telegraph lines in the country. There are many practical business reasons for such a course, a few of which I will specify.

Glancing, in the first place, at all the precedents, it must be remembered that all the telegraph lines of the Old World belong to the governments of the countries in which they are located. Communication by telegraph has become almost as common, and quite as necessary, as communication by letter. Why should not the two branches of what is really one service to the public be brought together in this country, as in other countries, and placed under one management? It would certainly be a great convenience to the people if every telegraph office were a post-office, and every post-office a telegraph office. As letters are sent to all parts of the United States for two cents, and papers and magazines at one cent for every four ounces, so, I think, a telegraph message should be sent to any part of the United States at the lowest price at which experience has shown it possible that the transmission can be effected. The Press, which sends long messages, and these partly for the general information of the people, if partly also for private business gain, should be charged half the usual rates.

In regard to the method of conveying the property of the telegraph companies to the Government, a law should, in my judgment, be passed by Congress, regulating all the purchases in such a way that every company should be bound by a principle. Each telegraph company should select an arbitrator, and the Government should choose another. In case of disagreement between these two, they should choose a third, who ought to be a man thoroughly experienced, and regarded as an expert in the business. These arbitrators should have power to examine all reports and accounts,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so as to arrive at the fact as to the actual net profits which the line or lines had earned during any given year—say 1885, inasmuch as the transfer of the telegraph property from private hands to the public should be made at once—the sooner the better—if the public benefits to which I have pointed demand it. The Government should then establish, as a principle, that the stock of a company which had earned five per cent., clear profit, must be rated at par in making the purchase, and rated in the same ratio if earning either more or less. Thus, if five per cent. gave par, four per cent. would give eighty ; three per cent. sixty ; and so on.

It will be asked, of course, where the United States Government is to procure the money to make the purchases. It can be done very easily and satisfactorily. Let there be, for the purpose, an issue of three per cent. bonds. The Government will thus be enabled to reap the profit on the investment, as between three and five per cent., and also gain on the constantly increasing business and by the great saving in rent of offices. This two per cent. surplus would form a sinking fund for the redemption and payment of the bonds. These bonds should have fifty years to run. No difficulty would be experienced in raising the money, as individuals and estates would be glad to invest in such securities. Under this arrangement, the United States Government would, in much less than fifty years, own all the telegraph lines in the country, and actually without cost to the Government or people. This principle was adopted by the English Government, and was found to be just to all.

It is imagined by some persons that danger would arise from the ownership of the telegraph lines by the United States, on account of our frequent changes in the administration of the government. But I believe this apprehension is entirely without foundation. The measure would be for the good of all political parties, as well as of all the people. The Government telegraph lines would be in no greater danger than the post-office. The overturn or change in the Government does not destroy the administration of the post-office, but often helps to improve it.

Is it asked, how long a time would elapse before the people would enjoy the benefits of reduced telegraph rates ? No doubt exists in my mind that if the United States Government should enter into the business, the reduction of expense in running the telegraph lines would begin at once. There would be no necessity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for so many telegraph offices—often in the same building—with their attendant expense for rent and attachés. The post-office would also be the telegraph office. The reduction in cost alone would be one of the means of enabling messages to be sent at a far lower price than at the present time. It would therefore be only a short time before the public would be reaping the advantages of the change in the system. As I have already explained, the United States Government would have possession and complete control over the telegraph systems of the country, and actually without cost to the people.

It may be objected, however, that not all telegraph companies are successful. Some of them do not pay. But why? For the simple reason that the expenses are too great in operating the lines. Often two or three offices belonging to different companies are located in a small place. There is not business enough for all of them to live upon. They contend with each other for business, and, in the strife, rates are cut so as not to pay operating expenses, in that district, for either of them. This result is of no permanent benefit to the public at large, and the companies are unable to maintain themselves during the conduct of the useless warfare.

And now the final question arises: Would the telegraph companies agree to sell their lines to the Government? As a practical answer to this question it may be sufficient to say that the plan was found to be a good one in England, and that it proved to be fair and acceptable to all parties.

CYRUS W. FIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY AM I A UNITARIAN?

THE Unitarian Church of America is a body small in comparison with most of the other churches. It has no creed, imposed by authority, and the single statement, which all its members would agree to, is the statement that they would have no such formal dogmatic statement. Every member of this church is free to make his own formula of belief or conviction, or to make none.

Practically, however, the Unitarians are people who lay great stress on character. They would say that the essentials of religion are Faith, Hope and Love. This is what all communions say. But, while other communions have to spend much money and time, in maintaining against each other their ritual, their dogma, or their method of government, this Unitarian Church, having no special ritual, no distinctive doctrine, and no authorized form of government, exists only to proclaim its gospel, and to bring in the kingdom of God, in the world. Ask what this gospel is,—and you find it is simply Faith, Hope, and Love, the elements of Eternal Life, as Paul described them. They are the Unitarian's religion. Faith in a Father above himself,—Hope in an Eternal Future, and Love for all the children of that Father. He organizes with others, that he may quicken his own Faith, Hope, and Love, and may extend Faith, Hope, and Love over the world, and he has no other object in his organization.

I have been asked by the Editor of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW to say in a short article why I am a Unitarian. This means, why am I a member of the Unitarian Church of America, for there are many Unitarians, who have not connected themselves with it. There is a sense in which all Christians are Unitarians. Dr. Hook, who was called the "high and dry" doctor of the Anglican Church, says in his Dictionary: "UNITARIANS. A title which certain heretics who do not worship the true God assume

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most unfairly, to convey the impression that those who worship the one and only God do not hold the doctrine of the Divine Unity. Christians worship the Trinity in Unity, and the Unity in Trinity." Dr. Hook is entirely mistaken in his historical statement, as in some others. In fact, the name Unitarian seems to have been first applied to the people in Hungary, who wished to harmonize all confessions, and held by the decrees for toleration formulated by the Convention at Thorde in 1563. It would be interesting to know whether the word "Unitarius" occurs earlier in history. The Unitarian communion is as old as Christianity.

The Unitarian Church believes in the present work of God in the world. The words, "Our Father" of the Lord's Prayer, "Children of God," "Sons of God," in the New Testament, are not poetical phrases to these people, but expressions of the real divinity of human nature, to which all its improvement in the past is due, and from which indefinite improvement in the future may be expected. The Unitarian Church has been called in ecclesiastical language, "the Church of the Holy Spirit," so resolute are its writers to admit no authority in the past, which shall overrule the right of the present to examine every opinion, and to determine, in the present moment, the value of every law. This does not imply any disrespect to the mission of Christ, or the instruction of the Gospels, or the historic Church. The Unitarians are constantly charged with such disrespect. It is supposed that they will be "Antinomians," or lawless people. But in truth, as has been said, they lay very great stress on character, and, in practice, regard character as the test of religion. Having no formula of creed to offer as such a test, they have no way to judge of men but by their fruits, and they seek no other.

It ought not be difficult to understand, philosphically, the position of such a communion regarding Christian history, or the Christian records. The Church of the Holy Spirit believes in God's presence with man. As he is present "now," he was present "then." Respect for his present love does not involve disrespect for his older revelations, for if he was present "then," he is present "now." If, indeed, men were not quite besotted in their determination to make God into a larger man, and to bind him with the restraints of time and place, it would be simply impossible for them to conceive of him as making one Revelation at one "*time*," and another at another "*time*"—or to make more Revelation at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one "*time*" than at another. There is no "time" to the Infinite God. The creeds, even, are willing to admit this. If man would admit it, in their own common sense and common language, we should be spared many of the annoyances of men-made theologies.

First, then, the Unitarian Church exists for the worship of God. But faith in God is not the only element of religious life. And, like all other Christian people, the Unitarian Church believes in the immortality of man. It undertakes to manage life here on the plan and scale in which immortal beings can and should live. It is not enough to believe in immortality. Man must live as immortals live.

And such faith in God and such expectation of immortality involve of course personal duty, and define man's personal relation to other men. The Unitarian Church is seeking the coming of God's kingdom. His kingdom will come, as men all recognize God as father. Their own brotherhood follows, of necessity. The Scripture texts therefore, again, are, for us, not exaggerated.

"God has made of one blood all nations of men." "Bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." These texts state for the Unitarian Church the relation of man with man.

And, indeed, here is the whole of the Unitarian religion, and, as Unitarians believe, the whole religion of Jesus Christ: Faith in God, Hope of Heaven, Love of Man. When Paul named "Faith, Hope and Love," as the abiding and eternal elements of life, the same for men as for angels, he was not speaking rhetorically. He meant that in these three may be found the full life of God's children.

I suppose it necessary, in the outset of my article, to make this statement of what the Unitarian Church is, because I know very well that half the readers of this article have never heard of that church—or if they have, have heard of it only in some smart fling in a controversial sermon, where Unitarians and Universalists are turned over to contempt, perhaps with "paynim hounds," or perhaps with "publicans or sinners."

Why should there be any separate church to maintain these simple principles which belong to all Christian communions? The answer is simple. The Unitarian Church exists simply to bring in the kingdom of God. It has nothing else to do. It cannot call a council to try a preacher for heresy. It has no creed and can have no heretics. If a congregation wants a man to preach,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he will preach. If it does not come to hear him he must address the walls. The Unitarian Church never has to revise its platform. It has no platform to revise. It has none of the side occupations of the other churches. It simply has to bring in the kingdom of God, to make His presence and power clear to people who have not found Him, have not seen Him, or have not heard Him.

This is no place to go into a discussion of the points of detail where Christians of this nineteenth century school, or of the Present Holy Spirit, differ from the theologies which took form between the fourth century and our own time.

It is enough to say, that we regard the fixed old formulas of those theologies as always dangerous, and as often oppressive. The world grows. Its science advances because its knowledge advances. Religion, which is the life of man with God, is always the same. But theology, which is the statement of what man knows and can tell of himself, of Heaven and of God, ought to be always new.

It is because of the cramp or restriction, placed by mediæval theology on the thought and purpose of educated men, that educated and intelligent men speak sometimes with contempt, more often with doubt, and very often in denial of the Christian religion. A letter before me, from an accomplished scholar in natural science, in England, says frankly, "I have never been able to understand myself, how Christianity has ever survived modern astronomy and the study of comparative religion." When I read this to a Unitarian, who has been educated in the Unitarian Church, and has known little or nothing of theological dogma, he cannot understand it. "What in the world has modern astronomy to do with the religion of Jesus Christ?" he asks. But many a reader of these words will know perfectly well, what this writer means.

So long as men believed, with Dante, for instance, that this world was the center of creation, and the important part of it, that sun and stars were only convenient lights set to enlighten this world, and revolving daily about it, so long it was not difficult to believe that God once took a special human form, went and came in Palestine, and, if you please, died upon the cross. So long it was possible to think of him in a certain place; to think of the Saviour as now "sitting at his side," and to adopt in good faith many of the mediæval formulas of theology or Christology.

But, in that sense, this is not possible now. When a man says

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

now that God was incarnate in Christ, he does not mean what the Church fathers of the middle ages meant. When, therefore, an amiable and well-meaning man, like Dr. Thomson, says that when Jesus Christ walked about Nazareth, he must have taken a peculiar interest in traveling about the hills he had made, he says something which is simply ridiculous to men of this time. They know that Nazareth and its hills were formed by an Infinite Power, about whose name there may be question; about whose nature there may be division. And they know that it is not in any fair sense of words that any one says that Jesus Christ, who walked in Nazareth, made those hills, any more than Mary, his mother, made them.

When, therefore, any church of any communion ties up in its creed any statement which looks that way, such a man as writes this letter to me simply sets aside that church, as belonging to an era before Galileo.

But the Unitarian Church makes no such pretensions. It worships God as the father of men. It is willing to say that Jesus Christ taught the world to worship God as the father of men. But God had been man's father before Jesus Christ; and many men in many lands, who never heard of Jesus Christ, tried to worship God as father of men. To the Unitarian Church, the "comparative religion," or the study of comparative religion, brings no terror. It only brings more examples of the universal presence of that Spirit of Truth, which in the New Testament is called "the Holy Spirit." It is, as has been said, to this Holy Spirit, always present with men because men are of the divine nature, that the Unitarian Church, from first to last, appeals.

What we try for, then, in forming our churches, is religion, independent of theology. Let every man have such a theology as he likes. He may or may not make a statement as to the nature of God. He may or may not understand the nature of Christ. He may or may not know how to reconcile free knowledge in God with free will in man. All this is no affair of the Unitarian Church. For what we are eager about is religion, and not theology. A simple and provable theology certainly is a very good thing; just as a simple doctrine of attraction, or of electricity, or of evolution, is a very good thing; but religion, the life of man with God, or his infinite and immortal life, is a greater reality, and is the only reality for which our churches as churches stand and care.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We withdraw ourselves from the other organizations because they do not yet say this. Their leaders do not yet dare proclaim the severance from religion, of human opinion about God and man and Christ. When they do, they also will proclaim themselves Unitarians. The Unitarian Church consists of men and of churches who in practice make this distinction.

We make it in our time, chiefly because the mediæval theological armor worn by most of the church is so oppressive. It does not belong to this time. Literature will have nothing to do with it. Science will have nothing to do with it. History shows pitilessly that it came from very questionable origins; and in practice it does not serve any purpose of to-day.

Take the doctrine of total depravity—the invention of ecclesiastics. Nine-tenths of the Christians of America try to believe it to-day. They try to believe that nine-tenths of the human family are "incapable of good." They can be made to say, on occasion, that nine-tenths of the human family, not having been converted, are "of their own nature inclined to evil," and that therefore "every person born into this world deserves God's wrath and damnation." That is the Sunday theory—but if you meet these men Monday they hold no such theory. Every one of them asks a stranger the road—quite sure that he will tell the truth if he can—quite sure that he is not inclined of nature to lie. The people of this country have with great confidence trusted its whole welfare to universal suffrage. Christian men join cordially in that trust. They never would have done so had they really believed that all the voters, or nine-tenths of the voters, are "incapable of good," or that they "deserve God's wrath and damnation." The statement of such depravity is a bit of old-fashioned talk, which only hampers the church. The Unitarian Church cuts loose from all such talk; it will not puzzle young people or old people with it. It holds to religion, and it bids theology stand on one side.

I doubt if it is necessary for me to give other illustrations. I think that illustrations of the cramp, as I called it, the hinderance and obstruction of theologies, which the churches carry as matters of sentiment and history, and not as matters of present conviction, have been presenting themselves, all along, to people who have read thus far in this paper. A statesman of some distinction, said to my brother, Charles Hale, some twenty years ago,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the men in the pulpit must keep quiet about political matters. "They make us say we believe a lot of things that nobody does believe, and if we say that, they must keep themselves quiet about the affairs of the State." This was, substantially, his declaration. Now that notion is derived simply and purely from the unwillingness,—mainly fed in colleges and "seminaries,"—to throw old things overboard in theology. The professors and historians feel as they might if you asked them to break some fine old stained glass windows, because the figures were out of drawing. "It is so venerable," they say. "It is so in harmony with our traditions." But they will find out, and are finding out, that the "Spirit of Truth" does not care much for traditions or venerableness. The children of God will be apt to assert the privileges of children of God. God is at hand. And His children are very apt, when they have once began, to confide in Him.

The particular point where, in America, the mediæval theology has given way most hopelessly in our time, is its horrible dogma about hell. That myth is too terrible for an intelligent, God-loving race of children of God to hold to, after they have any sense of their own rights and powers. Our friends, the Universalists, have the honor of leading the attack on this dogma, and they must have a noble satisfaction at seeing now that people have come to that last step of belief, in which they say they have always known it was untrue.* But the creeds maintain it still. No religious communion excepting the Unitarians and Universalists has dared to throw it over, as a bit of mere pagan addition to Christian truth. While the sects hold to it, they will remain so far parted from the simple church of the "Spirit of Truth."

And here I ought to say that there is no distinction, excepting those of history and organization, between the Unitarian and the Universalist churches of America. As organizations, they spring from two origins. I suppose it is fair to say that the Universalist churches are the direct and legitimate offspring of Calvinism. "If an infinite atonement were made, why should not all men be saved by it." This was the pitiless question of its founders.

* Louis Agassis says there are three stages of popular opinion regarding any new statement:

1. That it is contrary to the Bible.
2. That it has been announced before.
3. That the people talking always believed it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Unitarian churches of New England came from Arminianism. "We know salvation is free! It is free for all men." But these are distinctions of the past,—are only of interest to historians. The two churches now, with different national organizations, stand, as I suppose, for just the same ideas.

Another illustration of the wretched hamper of the creeds which naturally attracts attention now, is the difficulty of adjusting them to what men really know of the word of God in the world. A man is satisfied, for instance, that the nebular theory stands on good ground,—that the presumption is in its favor. He need not, therefore, disbelieve that a present spirit is in all the motions and changes which that theory supposes. He may worship that Spirit—may give Him a name. He may feel and know that this present Spirit is in all life. But, when he goes to church, and is told by the preacher, that this Spirit made the world "by his Son," or "through his Son"—he answers, at once, that this is not the present law—God in all life—which he has been told is the basis of religion. He says that the intervention of subordinate—or in any sense secondary powers—between the power which is, and the movement which is to be explained—is a return to the spirit of heathenism, or of many gods.

But I may as well stop in one place as another in enumerating instances where the mediæval creeds, still existing in most churches, defy and stand in the way of the intelligent, conscientious well-informed convictions of to-day.

But here, just at the year 1886, there comes in a very curious temporary suggestion, which at this moment is an element of a good deal of importance when a man is asked why he is attached to the Unitarian Church.

The suggestion is made on all hands, that all the churches are ridding themselves of their mediævalism as fast as they can. The ministers preach it less and less. Only the ministers believe in it at all, it is often said. In substance the laymen do not care for it. When one contends that Jesus Christ did not make the hills around Nazareth; or that there is no eternal hell; or that men are not totally depraved, we are told that he is merely attacking straw men. When we say that Faith, Hope and Love are the essentials, we are told that all churches hold to them.

This statement of the laxity of all the mediæval churches is well founded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The truth is that the whole method of religious communion has been changed in the last two centuries, and therefore the whole statement of the sects has been changed. Nobody knows this better than the professed theologians, and I need not spend a word in arguing it with them. To laymen, who do not pretend to be professed theologians,—there are a hundred illustrations easy to cite. Imagine the minister of an Episcopal church asking one of his parishoners why he does not receive the sacrament. Imagine the reply, "Because I do not believe that Jesus of Nazareth is now sitting in Heaven awaiting the last day, with his flesh and bones and all that appertaineth to human nature. This is one of the articles of your church, and I will not pretend that I believe it." We know perfectly well what the minister's answer would be. It would be simply, "Do not distress yourself about that; that is simply a matter of history. We print it in the prayer book as matter of history. At best, the language is obscure in all statements written in another century. One man may interpret it in one way, and another in another, and a third may dismiss it without interpreting it at all." Nor is such laxness at all peculiar to the Episcopal Church. I think the Methodist Church of America would receive me into its pulpit to-morrow, without requiring my assent to one of its articles, if it really believed that I regarded Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. Why! even in the Catholic Church they are perfectly willing to waive the assumption of infallibility. Thus, in their infallibility, they have said, and still say that no man or woman shall read Milton's Paradise Lost. But does anybody suppose that an intelligent Catholic hesitates to read Milton's Paradise Lost? Or if, having read it, he met the priest and asked for absolution for his sin, would this be anything but a joke? So, I could name without difficulty fifty Unitarians who are now received to the communion of churches of stiff Calvinistic creeds, with the perfect understanding on the part of the persons who receive them, that they do not believe these creeds.

Now all this means, simply, that the methods and statements of churches are wholly changed. The directors of churches once thought these things of the first importance. They do not think so now. They think they are of secondary importance, or of no importance at all. The truth is that the Christian church can no longer afford to play with this fol-de-rol of minute distinctions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When a host is gathering for battle, the chiefs of its different corps do not discuss the figures of the embroidery on the jackets of the men. There are now many people, who are people of consideration too, who tell the church to her face that she is a venerable humbug; that the church must prove herself good for something. There are many people who tell her ministers that there is no God, and no immortality. There are some there who say they know no distinction between right and wrong. There are so many of these people—intelligent and considerable people—that she has to determine to attend to the essentials of her business and to let the non-essentials go. "It may be for years and it may be forever," that she must give up the luxury of fooling with them. "The business of the Church of Christ is to be on the aggressive. She has no defensive armor. When she is not on the aggressive she is lost." Like everything else in Heaven above or on the earth beneath, she will be judged by her fruits, and only so.

To this general statement, every large-minded churchman of every communion consents. True, you would find men who did not assent, but they are "backward-looking sons of time." They are not men of this age. They are specimens of another age, probably formed with care and difficulty in some mediæval school of theology. The statement I have made would be agreed upon in spirit or for "substance of doctrine" by all broad churchmen of whatever communion.

It is here that there comes in the very curious temporary suggestion now made to us on every side.

Does not this show then that the Unitarian Church, as an independent or in any way a separate communion, is unnecessary? If a Roman Catholic priest will excuse me with a laugh, from the commands of the Index; if an Episcopal priest can say to me that the thirty-nine articles are only a matter of history; if a Presbyterian is willing to receive me to his communion table, nay to baptize my child, why should I be more careful about their consistency than they are? Why should I not take them at their word? "Let the dead bury the dead! If these gentlemen are not annoyed by such relics of mediæval darkness, why should I be?"

I put that question once to an intelligent and devoted preacher who was coming to us from an Orthodox pulpit. He answered it in a single sentence. He had given me a sketch of his last Sun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

day's sermon. Nothing more broad was ever preached by Martineau or Bellows or Savage. He had preached it to six hundred people in an Evangelical Orthodox church in Connecticut, and they seemed well pleased. I said, at once, "Why come to us then? Stay with this people. We do not care a fig what they call themselves. Congregationalists or Unitarians—that is all one. Half our churches do not take the Unitarian name, which is in fact the only purely earthly thing we carry. Stay where you are. Nothing can be more free than that is." The poor man looked puzzled, for an instant, and then said, "Oh, you do not understand at all. Why! I shall have to pay for that sermon, now, all through four or five Sundays. For so long a time as that, at least, I must preach about Noah's Ark, or Solomon's Temple, or the fall of man, or the decrees, or some other bit of those things. It is not more than once in six weeks that I have the privilege of such audacious freedom as I enjoyed last Sunday." When one asks who takes away his freedom, the answer varies. But it always is "they" who will not permit, whoever "they" may be. It is some "association" or "consociation," some "synod" or "presbytery," some newspaper editor or some bishop, some coterie of gossips or some council of prelates which practically has the power of hindering this young man from saying in the pulpit of God's house what he believes to be the truth of God.

That clergyman's statement of his unwillingness to be longer governed by "*they*" or by "*them*" was a sufficient answer to my question. We who are in the Unitarian Church choose to be where there is no such oversight or watchfulness. Unless a man will proclaim the best thing he knows, we do not want him to proclaim anything. We do not want any half-hearted utterances. We do not want any blinded leaders.

Granting, however, that a preacher cannot, in honor, preach in the pulpit of a church which holds to theories which he believes false, laymen are told that this is no concern of theirs. They do not want to preach. And it is in conformity with this view, that so many Unitarians now assist in the worship of churches, whose creeds belong hundreds of years ago, and do not belong to our time. There is, however, certainly a great danger here.

A man is expected to sit, or to kneel in a church where the ministrations, to a certain extent, have the ring of a mere function. That is to say, they are continued, week in and out, not because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anybody cares much for them now in this form, but because some one else arrayed them so a great while ago. Now, here, the whole question is, whether the service is a function, or whether it is genuine and spontaneous. I shall never forget the expression, almost of agony, on the face of a Catholic priest at Mayence, whose duty it was to repeat the Lord's prayer thirty-five times in one hour, in a service called the "triginta." He tried so hard to make the words real every time, and he knew the hypocrisy of the whole if they were not. I wonder if that poor fellow is in this world now.

Now, if that man be a hypocrite, his service does me no good, nor anybody; no, nor if he be a machine. For myself, I can attend the service of the Roman Church with pleasure and profit. I am no sectarian, and though that church is "first of schismatics," I, who belong to the older church, can condone her heresy. If I find myself in a Catholic town in Europe, where there is no Protestant Church, I always go to worship with the Catholics. I can continue to do so, till the thing rings false. Perhaps the priest shrugs his shoulders when he talks to me in private of a miracle. Perhaps, because he knows I am a heretic, he makes to me confessions which he would not make standing in the pulpit. From that moment, I cannot join in a service conducted by that man. Here, I think, all serious men would agree with me, be they clergymen or laymen.

But why not carry that analogy farther? What is the moral attitude of a church which deliberately says that certain lines of inquiry shall not be pursued? What is the attitude of the Roman Church, which publishes, every year, a list of books which shall not be read? What is the attitude of the Methodist Church, which, within the year past, has been turning professors out of its Southern colleges, because they assented to the doctrine of evolution? What is the attitude of the Episcopal Church, broad as it tries to be? Does it believe in the "resurrection of the body," in the sense with which common people take those words, in the sense of Michael Angelo's picture of the Judgment? When I asked an Episcopal minister that question, he said if I did not like the Apostles' Creed, I might take the Nicene—which says nothing about the resurrection of the body. What is the attitude of a church, which, while it claims all the advantages of a creed, offers you two, and tells you that you may pick and choose? We understand entirely the position of a church which binds no man

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to any written creed. That is the position of the Unitarian Church. But, to have a creed when you want it, and not to have it when you do not want it—to have a creed in public, and not to have one in private—that is a different thing. When we find that in a church, we say the false ring affects the whole. How are we to train our children in such a church? Are they to repeat the creeds or not? Are they to repeat one or the other? Are they to turn over to the end of the book and read the articles of religion? Or are they to be told that these are only good for clergymen, and not for little boys and girls?

So of the position of Unitarians in a Presbyterian Church, generous as that church often is. We are told that we may safely worship with our Presbyterian brethren, and that they will not be hard on us. They will not ask us to sign their articles. They will ask us to send our children to their Sunday School. They will ask us to contribute to their missions. We must, indeed, do this as men of honor, if we share in the advantages of their united worship. But what are the Sunday schools and missions to teach? Why, we are asked to help to teach the doctrines of the Westminster Catechism. The Presbyterian Church has, at no time, squarely and above board, said that modern philosophy, modern literature, modern science, and, in a word, the whole modern world, repudiate those doctrines. We may, then, sit in the pews. We need not sing an offensive hymn. But does this business stop there? No! We are made partners in the guilt of that church, if we do what we are asked to do. Every time she refuses ordination to an honest man, simply because he does not believe in the eternal damnation of half mankind, we shall be made partners in what she is doing.

Simply—and very fortunately—it is impossible to draw any line, in a country where the church is free, between the responsibility of the clergy and that of the laity. Fortunately indeed! That church is near its end, which has one creed for its laymen and another for its ministers.

I write all this with entire kindness to Christians in other religious communions. I know too well the difficulties of their position to be hypercritical or severe. Here are suits of armor in which their fathers did battle in the days of chivalry, and did battle well. And now the men of to-day have outgrown that armor. Yet it is so beautiful. It has so many noble associations! It is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very hard to put it off and to be done with it forever. We know all that, and we are sorry for them. Some of us have had this very thing to do. But because we are sorry they must not ask us to put the armor on.

Simply: the Unitarian Church, quite indifferent to tradition, exists only to bring in the kingdom of God where it can. It has no other reason for existence. It need not discuss decrees, or rubrics, or embroideries, or doctrines. It is all one to us whether Athanasius ever wrote his creed, or whether anybody meant it for a creed, or no. We are the living Church of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit of God, to-day, with every suggestion which the Spirit of God has made from the beginning, "guides us unto truth." The Saviour tells us that this spirit will guide us "into all truth." We accept no lesser formula. The Holy Spirit speaks in the last discovery of science. The Holy Spirit teaches Pasteur and guides him toward the saving of life. The Holy Spirit speaks in all history. If you had no Holy Spirit, you would have no Columbus, or Luther, no Washington or Franklin. The present Holy Spirit is guiding every conscience to-day. Shall I give my time to this drunkard? Or shall I spend it with that stranded exile? It is the Holy Spirit, the present God, who decides: Emmanuel: God with us.

It is on this direction that the Unitarian Church relies.

E. E. HALE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A VETO BY JEFFERSON DAVIS.

THE examination of the Confederate archives, now in progress, has recently brought to light a veto of President Davis of a bill creating the office of Commanding-General of the Confederate armies. Mr. Davis vetoed it in the early days of strict construction of the constitution of the Confederate States, on the ground that it infringed upon the powers of the President.

Three years later, when the Richmond Government had found it necessary to assume some of the powers reserved to the States, in order to prosecute successful war for the establishment of a States Rights' Government, thus bringing down upon itself the denunciation of Governors Brown, Vance and Benham, President Davis signed a bill of similar character and equally objectionable, in spite of the reasons which he had assigned in 1862.

The first bill in question, passed in March, 1862, was as follows :

"*An Act to create the office of General of the Armies of the Confederate States.*

"*The Congress of the Confederate States do enact :* That there shall be, and is hereby created, the office of Commanding-General of the Armies of the Confederate States, which office shall continue only during the pleasure of the President.

"SEC. 2. *Be it further enacted :* That the said officer shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. His usual headquarters shall be at the seat of government, and he shall be charged under the direction of the President with the general control of military operations, the movements and discipline of the troops, and the distribution of supplies among the armies of the Confederate States, and may, when he shall deem it advisable, take command in person of our army or armies in the field.

"SEC. 3. *Be it further enacted :* That the pay of the commanding-general aforesaid shall be four hundred dollars per month without allowances ; and if the officer appointed under this act shall be an officer of the permanent army, the appointment shall not affect his rank as such, but he shall receive none of the pay and allowance of his grade as an officer of the permanent army, while holding the office created by this act."

SEC. 4 fixed the number and the rank of the staff of the commanding-general. The above act passed the Confederate House of Representatives March 3, 1862, by a vote of fifty to sixteen. It passed the Senate on the 6th of March by a vote which was not recorded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Davis returned it, March 14, with the following objections:

"EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA,
"*March* 14, 1862.

"*To the Speaker of the House of Representatives:*

"Not being able to approve, I return with my objections in accordance with the duty imposed by the constitution, an act entitled, 'An Act to create the office of Commanding-General of the Armies of the Confederate States.'

"The act creates an office which is to continue during the pleasure of the President, but the tenure of office of the general to be appointed is without any other limitations than that of the office itself. The purpose of the act, so far as it creates a military bureau, the head of which at the seat of government, under the direction of the President, shall be charged with the movements of troops, and the supply and discipline of the army, I fully approve, but, by what I cannot regard otherwise than as an inadvertence on the part of Congress, the officer so appointed is authorized to take the field at his own discretion and command any army or armies he may choose, not only without the direction, but even against the will of the President, who could not consistently with this act prevent such conduct of the general otherwise than by abolishing his office.

"To show that the effect of this act would be highly detrimental to the army, it might be enough to say that no general would be content to prepare troops for battle, conduct their movements, and share their privations during a whole campaign, if he expected to find himself superseded at the very moment of action. But there is another ground which to my mind is conclusive. The constitution vests in the Executive the command-in-chief of the armies of the Confederacy; that command is totally inconsistent with the existence of an officer, authorized, at his own discretion, to take command of armies assigned by the President to other generals. The Executive could in no just sense be said to be Commander-in-Chief, if without the power to control the discretion of the general created by this act. As it cannot have been the intention of Congress to create the office of a general not bound to obey the orders of the Chief Magistrate, and as this seems to be the effect of the act, I can but anticipate the concurrence of Congress in my opinion that it should not become a law.

(Signed) "JEFFERSON DAVIS."

Upon hearing this message, the House sustained the veto by a vote of sixty-eight to one.

By an act which was approved by Mr. Davis January 23, 1865, the Confederate Congress enacted:

"That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer who shall be known and designated as General-in-Chief, who shall be ranking officer of the army, and as such shall have command of the military forces of the Confederate States."

On the 6th of February, 1865, General R. E. Lee, having been appointed General-in-Chief, was assigned to duty as such under the provisions of the above act.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN LANDLORDISM.

As Roman *Latifundia* is the disease which the special commissioner appointed by the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, to examine and report upon the general subject of land tenures in America, declares threatens to undermine the social and industrial, if not also the political life of the country, a further discussion of the facts appertaining thereto cannot be without interest. Whatever the opinions of its readers on this subject, it is gratifying to note that the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, now as always, is alive to the great practical industrial questions which most concern our national prosperity, and affords and invites their unprejudiced and intelligent discussion in its pages.

The importance of this land question is not overestimated in the commissioner's report. The Roman argument, however, is not a convincing one. Year by year the ghosts of the old Republics that hovered around our infant cradle as a nation, with mute warnings of disaster if we failed to heed their example, have gradually vanished in the light of a better knowledge than Pliny had, and a more certain conviction that there is very little of useful, practical comparison, in anything Roman with anything American. The coroner's verdict upon the Roman corpse, reached in the light of modern critical and historical investigation of the facts, is not "Latifundia perdidere Italiam." That most interesting of all national autopsies pointed to so many mortal maladies affecting the great republic of antiquity, that the social or political theorist of to-day may choose whichever he pleases to support his argument founded upon the history of Rome. To us the strangest thing should seem that Rome lived so long. The *ager publicus* remedy, at the time prescribed, was as absurd as would be a homœopathic pellet in the last stage of small-pox. The Roman body politic was affected by so many diseases, moral, social, religious, and political, that only a verdict of "general corruption" would cover the causes that contributed to the demise of the state. But as your commissioner has simply quoted these words of Pliny,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who was a better advocate and moralist than statesman, the Roman argument need not be further considered.

Pliny, whose Laurentian and other large estates made him at the time one of the most opulent and conspicuous of Roman landlords, was not so much occupied in courting the favors of his master, Trajan, and writing pleasant letters to his friends Tacitus and Cornelius Nepos, as to overlook any favorable opportunity of adding to his landed property, even when uncertain whether, without borrowing, he had the means for such a purchase. Even Land Commissioner Sparks, who hails from the rural districts of Illinois, with all his nervous apprehensions of land monopoly, and his uncertain convictions as to his power and duty, not from lack of ambition, would hardly think the time had arrived for him to play the role either of Licinius or Tiberius Gracchus.

Your commissioner says, "America has refused to benefit by the bitter experience of Europe in regard to the land question." Is this statement true? What has America omitted to do? Can he suggest any theory out of Plato's "Republic" or More's "Utopia" that we or our forefathers have neglected, affecting the question of land tenures? Would he have us adopt the purely paternal theory of government and prescribe just how many acres a man may own? Or would he adopt into our state constitutions the land lucubrations of Henry George, and make the state the great landlord and all the citizens its tenants? In framing both national and state constitutions, the people of the United States studiously prohibited the existence of a privileged class, and the possibility of large estates based upon feudal tenures, and supported by primogeniture rights. They could have done nothing more, unless they had limited the number of acres an individual could legally hold. There is no country in the world where the ownership and transfer of real property is so easy and simple as in America. It could not be more so.

Now to the facts and figures upon which your commissioner bases his argument showing a tendency to landlordism.

It is to be regretted that the census reports, prior to 1880, did not give the number of landlords and tenants in the United States, as such tables would either corroborate or refute your commissioner's conclusions as to the present tendency of land titles in America. But there is enough contained in the census report to show that there is not, as he contends, a gradual concentration of land titles

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into fewer hands, by the swallowing up of small estates; but that, on the contrary, the number of holdings is increasing year by year, while their individual area is year by year diminishing.

The number of persons of ten years of age, and over, in the United States, in the year 1880, was 36,761,607. Of these there were engaged in "gainful occupations" of all kinds 17,392,097. The other eighteen millions are not listed as doing anything, and their occupation, those who had any, is not known. Of this 17,392,097 persons of ten years of age and upwards, 7,670,493 are known to be engaged in agriculture, and 9,721,606 are engaged in other kinds of gainful occupation, including every known employment. But the census report contains the further important statement that "there is reason to believe" that persons have been returned as laborers who should have been returned as agricultural laborers, so that the number at that time of agricultural to other laborers was probably about in the ratio of 8 to 10. That the ratio of agricultural laborers yearly diminishes is true of this and all other countries; but this fact, though easily accounted for, has no bearing on the question under discussion.

By the census of 1880 it appears that the whole number of farms cultivated by their owners was about 3,000,000 and the whole number cultivated by tenants was about 1,000,000. What the relative proportion of tenants is to-day we have no means of knowing. Your commissioner assumes, without any support whatever for his assumption, that the proportion of tenants is increasing, and that the title to lands is yearly concentrating more and more into the hands of landlords. Let us examine the known data at our command and see whether they even tend to sustain this theory.

Taking the figures of several of the States, East, South, and West, we find that, in the year 1880, there were farms of over one thousand acres, the number given below, out of the whole number of farms in each of these States.

	Whole Number.	1000 Acres or over.	Average Acres.
New York	241,000	281	99
Pennsylvania	213,540	244	93
Alabama	135,864	1868	134
Georgia	138,624	3491	188
Michigan	154,000	84	90
Illinois	255,000	649	124
Nebraska	63,387	118	157
Kansas	138,561	235	155

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It can hardly be claimed, that, considering the cheapness of lands in the new States, and the large amount yet held by land speculators, this showing as to the average size of American farms indicates any very serious condition of landlordism.

But let us go a little further, and examine testimony yet more important in its bearing upon this question. Fortunately we have the figures from the census reports for the three last decades; which throw not a little light upon the subject and show clearly what the real tendency is.

	Number of Farms 1860.	Number of Farms 1870.	Number of Farms 1880.
New York	196,000	216,000	241,000
Illinois	143,000	202,000	255,000
Iowa	61,000	116,000	185,000
Nebraska	2,789	12,300	63,387
Texas	42,000	61,000	174,000
Georgia	62,000	69,000	135,000

In Illinois, which has such a prominent place in your commissioner's argument, we see that, in place of decreasing, the number of farms has more than trebled in twenty years, and this increase in number is not confined to the new states, although naturally less in the older states, so long as cheaper and richer lands can be had in the Mississippi and Missouri valleys. Thus, the tendency to smaller fee-simple holdings is increasing in America the same as in France, Belgium, Italy, and all other countries where there are no impediments, social or legal, to the transfer and ownership of land.

The following table prepared from the three last national census confirms the truth of this statement, showing that the average size of farms is diminishing in numbers of acres with the increase in numbers of farms and the growth and settlement of the country East, South, and West. The figures below give the number of acres of the average farm for the last three decades in the states named.

	Year 1860. Acres.	Year 1870. Acres.	Year 1880. Acres.
New York	106	105	99
Pennsylvania	109	103	93
Connecticut	99	93	80
Alabama	346	222	139
Arkansas	245	154	128
Georgia	430	328	188

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Year 1860. Acres.	Year 1870. Acres.	Year 1880. Acres.
Iowa	165	134	134
Louisiana	536	247	171
Mississippi	370	193	156
Virginia	324	246	167
Illinois	146	128	124
Texas	590	301	208

This shows a constant diminution in each succeeding decade in the size of the average farm. This tendency will undoubtedly rapidly increase, when the new cheap lands in the West are exhausted and the farmer must divide his farm among his children, instead of, as heretofore, giving his son or son-in-law a few hundred dollars with the benediction, "Go West, young man, and grow up with the country."

I may say, furthermore, that I have had personally to do with the settlement of several million acres of lands in Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska and Kansas. The great bulk of those lands were sold to actual settlers, and are now owned and occupied and farmed by them or their grantees. Occasionally an individual or a land company has bought several thousand acres, but only for the purpose of dividing up into small farms, and selling at a percentage of profit to purchasers for occupancy. From twenty-five years of observation and experience I am fully convinced *that the decided and unmistakable tendency is to smaller farms and larger number of occupying free-holders.*

Your commissioner is altogether mistaken, also, as to the mortgaged condition of farms in the West. Of course in Kansas, Dakota, Nebraska, and other very new States, the settlers have generally had to mortgage their lands in buying and improving them. But every one who has had to do with the loaning of money in Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois and Iowa knows that the number of mortgaged farms is diminishing even more rapidly than the diminution in the area of individual land holdings. In fact it has become so difficult to get farm loans in the states named, that many individuals and corporations have withdrawn their money altogether and are seeking other investments. When I first went to Chicago, forty years ago, and for many years thereafter, it was easier to get a 20 per cent. per annum farm mortgage than it is now a 6 per cent. mortgage; and the same is true of all the states named. The farmers there, generally speaking, are not only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

no longer borrowers, but very many of them are loaning money and keep a respectable balance in the bank.

In further illustration of this truth I may add, that, just after the panic of 1873, and during the years 1874–5 and 6 I loaned several hundred thousand dollars in Illinois and Iowa upon farm mortgages, and all of these loans, with two exceptions, were paid. These exceptions were in cases of large farmers, who were speculating in cattle in the Chicago market, failed in business, and turned over the mortgaged lands to me, aggregating about three thousand acres of mostly cultivated farms, which I divided up and rented to about a dozen tenants. These lands were afterward nearly all bought by these tenants, and, so far as I know, are now owned by them or their grantees.

I could cite a great many similar instances in support of my position. In fact, "*Nulla vestigia retrosum.*" They point all one way and not backward, nor in the direction of landlordism, but, like the census reports referred to above, in the direction of the subdivision of land and its ownership by the actual farmers.

Thirty years ago there existed, in the states in the Mississippi Valley lying east of the river, the same condition of things as is now apparent in Dakota, Minnesota and Nebraska—land loaning offices everywhere. These will disappear in due time and the farmer will own his land free from incumbrance.

Your commissioner mentions the fact that a number of large farmers have moved from their farms into Springfield, Illinois, and are now landlords. Let him wait till the "old man" is dead, and see how long the boys will live in Springfield and keep these farms undivided. No sensible old farmer will divide up his farm or sell it for another investment. He cannot leave it all to one son if he has other children, for county juries have a way of making wills, and of setting aside any landlordism tendency in them, on the ground of "insanity," "undue influence," etc. The time is drawing nigh only too quickly, when the American farmer, our cheap land all taken, will have to divide up a portion of his land during his lifetime among his children, as is now done on the continent of Europe.

There has gotten abroad an impression that large tracts of land in the far West are falling into the hands of foreign capitalists and corporations. That impression has no foundation in fact. A good deal of English and Scotch capital, it is true, has gone into cattle

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

raising in Texas and some of the territories; but I know of but two or three companies that have made any considerable purchase of land, and the aggregate held in fee by them all does not equal in value one of the smallest counties in Illinois or Iowa. Assuming (though it is by no means a self-evident proposition) that it is not well to encourage the investment of foreign capital in western agriculture, there is not, after all, much danger threatened from that source. The only possible legislation required might be such amendment by Congress of the present law as will make it more difficult for corporations and individuals to obtain a valid title to lands which have been "homesteaded and pre-empted" by parties who did not make their locations in good faith.

So much for the inductive argument. A word on the *a priori* probabilities.

It has become a postulate among farmers that, in order to make a farm pay, you must live on it yourself. So that, until capital shall become much more abundant and money much cheaper, there is not great liability of its seeking investment in land rent-rolls. I have never known of any money looking for that kind of an investment.

The large land-estates in England, farmed, as they must be, by proxy, do not pay two per cent. Many of them for some years past have paid no net income to their owners. But the small land-owners of England are still able to educate their children and have their beer, even when wheat is less than forty shillings a quarter.

Capital and industry untrammeled by legislation, follow laws which are as controling as the law of gravity. With the increasing density of population the price of labor falls. At the present rate of increase the population of the United States within a century would number over two thousand millions, and at the probable rate of increase will reach half that number. The supreme problem in interest has always been, and will always be, the problem of food. It did not require Malthus to teach the truth of this theory that "Population unchecked increases in a geometrical ratio; subsistence only in an arithmetical." Had the subsistence kept pace with human fecundity, the population of our earth, yet one of the juniors in the family of planets, would be almost beyond the power of computation. This subsistence must come from the soil, though Seth Green says, "it were easy to breed shad enough to feed the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world." The era of "hog and hominy" diet for the masses of the population is a short one in the lifetime of a nation, however prosperous that nation may be. We, too, must soon come down to a cheaper food. Therefore there is no other economic problem of profounder interest than that which affects land tenure and thereby land production. We, in America, do not feel its importance yet. We shall feel it soon enough, and cannot afford to ignore it even now.

There are two theories :—one that land held in large tracts, by wealthy owners, with abundant means for employing the best machinery and the best fertilizers and the latest science, can be made to produce most, and, therefore, to support the largest number of people. The other, that land held in small tracts and cultivated by the owner, with the thrift and economy which ownership stimulates, is capable of furnishing the largest supply of food.

Beyond all question the collateral advantages of the last method, moral, social, and political, are infinitely superior. They only are in harmony with the American polity. The instinct of ownership is more universal here than any where else in the world. It is the highest duty of government to encourage it. Every man who owns the land he cultivates has given a pledge to sustain law and order; to resist and put down the despotism of anarchy, whether it appear in the unmasked conspiracy of Catiline, or the less threatening but more dangerous guise of modern socialism.

The people, left to themselves, under the guidance of economic law, will settle in the best way all economic problems. All the government has to do is to keep the peace. When it assumes to act the paternal role by legislative interference of whatever character with the untrammeled investment of capital or labor, it commits the one unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost of industrial and political economy. The most melancholy illustration of this truth may be seen in Germany to-day; a great empire sinking deeper with every struggle into the quicksands of imperial violation of laws which are above even imperial power.

HENRY STRONG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

Too much cannot be said in condemnation of the reckless grants of our public lands to railroads and other corporations, and of the fraudulent entries made under the pre-emption, homestead and timber-culture laws. It is one of the most imperative duties of Congress and the courts to undo as far as possible the evils that have been perpetrated in past years by the prodigality of our legislators and the frauds of adventurers and speculators. In calling the attention of the public pointedly to the great importance of not having large tracts of our lands in the ownership of corporations and individuals, often non-residents or foreigners, but having the land in great part owned and tilled by actual settlers, THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has done good service.

Few Americans, however, who understand these matters, will see cause for alarm in "the unexpected analogies that will appear between the agrarian concerns of the American republic and those of ancient Rome." It is quite true that Rome had a public domain, and that large portions of it were occupied by the wealthy families to the exclusion of many members of the poorer classes, and that the large land-owners gradually extended the boundaries of their estates until the small farmers had almost entirely disappeared. A number of causes contributed to this very undesirable result. The constitution was such as to place the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the government almost entirely in the hands of the wealthy land-owners and money-lenders; the small farmer had to compete with slave labor on the large plantations, and was often compelled to serve in the army during the summer months when his presence on his little farm was of the utmost importance, while the slaves of his rich neighbor did not go to war, and the crops on the larger estates were therefore seen after carefully; the power which the constitution gave the wealthy enabled them to discriminate most unfairly against the poorer farmers in regard to taxes and the use of the public lands; and the law of debtor and creditor was so severe against the former that whenever a small farmer, in consequence of his enforced absence on military service, his unfair competition with slave labor or other causes, got in debt, his condition was deplorable, and he was in many cases forced to part with his property. Large and growing estates and the disappearance of peasant proprietors were the inevitable results.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It need not be said that, in this country, a very different condition of things prevails. Notwithstanding the undue influence sometimes exerted by corporations and "money-kings" in governmental affairs, the organization of our national and state governments is on such a broad popular basis as to make it impossible for the wealthy few to permanently domineer over the many and to dictate the legislation and the policy of government. On the contrary, the results of the granger movement, the power exerted by workingmen and their organizations in politics and legislation, and out of them, and numerous other indications, point unmistakably to the conclusion that large capitalists and corporations will hereafter find themselves more and more hampered in their operations, and their property endangered by hostile legislation and public opinion, resulting from the real or supposed interests of the poorer classes.

While there are some very large tracts of land owned by single individuals or companies, there has been a constant tendency pretty much everywhere to subdivide the land and disperse it among a larger and larger number of owners. One need but go into any good farming community and inquire how the number and size of the existing farms compare with those of twenty-five years ago, to be convinced of the truth of this assertion. Many of the bonanza farms, extensive cattle-ranches and grants of land to railroads, have yielded to this tendency, to which the owners of these large tracts have often contributed greatly. While the number of tenants has increased rapidly, the number of land-owners has also increased with great rapidity, and is to-day nearly three times as great as the number of tenants. It is true that, occasionally, a land-owner is forced to sell his farm and become a tenant, but the cases are far more numerous in which a man passes over from the tenant to the land-owning class. A century ago the greater part of the land on the continent of Europe was owned in large tracts; primogeniture, and entails prevailed almost everywhere; the sale and transfer of land was difficult and expensive—often entirely impossible—while the tillers of the soil were, if not actually serfs, commonly in a most wretched condition. This system, which the revolution in France and constitutional and legislative changes in other countries broke up, had scarcely anything in common with the land system of this country, where primogeniture does not exist, and entails and settlements are so restricted as to be practically inoperative, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

feudal dues and services are unknown. The two systems cannot well be compared, although it may be interesting and profitable to contrast them. In their contrast they show the totally different conditions out of which they grew. In like manner, although we still retain usually, "as vague and shadowy forms," many of the feudal arrangements inherited from the mother country, we may well contrast "the agricultural concerns of the American Republic" with those of Great Britain, where primogeniture, entails and settlements, and expensive and tedious and complicated methods of transferring land still prevail, so that it is extremely difficult for a tenant to become a land-owner. One can scarcely conceive of a greater contrast than that presented by landlordism, as it commonly exists in this country, and landlordism in Ireland, where the tenant has been forced to make and maintain all the improvements on his holding, and, until recently, has had no security for the labor and money which he had invested in them; where many of the holdings are too small and poor to maintain a family decently; where the opportunities other than in farming for obtaining a livelihood are extremely rare, and the tenants have been compelled by circumstances to undertake to pay impossible rents, and where the suffrage and the government have been in the control mainly of the small class of land-owners. The worst features of this sort of landlordism have, however, already disappeared from Ireland, while, in England, land reformers are urging with some prospect of success such changes in the land laws as will make these laws very similar to those which regulate "the agricultural concerns of the American Republic."

While there are exceptions, and tenants are found who are unthrifty or whose lot is a hard one, as a rule the American tenant-farmer prospers, and in very many cases passes from the tenant to the land-owning class. It is a decided advantage to many an agricultural laborer and farmer's landless son that numbers of owners of farms have become so prosperous that they do not care to till the soil themselves, or, for other reasons, rent their land. It often happens that a young man, engaged in agricultural or other labor, by thrift and economy, lays by enough to stock a small farm which he rents "on the shares" or for a fixed sum. In a few years he saves enough to buy the property, paying perhaps one-half of the purchase money at once, and the remainder in annual payments extending through several years. The former owner is secured by a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mortgage on the farm. By the time the man has reached middle life he owns the farm free of debt. If he had not been able to rent the land on favorable terms, he could probably never have been able to accumulate enough money to purchase the farm. Men are found in every agricultural community who have in this way easily passed over from the agricultural laborer to the tenant, and from the tenant to the land-owning class. The existence of "landlordism" enables them to do this. In the transition period, after the farms have been bought, the new owners are of course commonly somewhat in debt. When the crops fail hardships sometimes occur, but, in the great majority of cases, the debt disappears in a few years and the man's family is amply provided for.

It is not surprising that the casual observer, seeing many hard-working tenants on poorly stocked farms, and many owners apparently deeply in debt, should be alarmed at the state of things. On closer observation one finds, however, that, in most cases, the hard-working tenant and the interest-paying owner are both prospering and rapidly becoming independent. Failures occur through unwise undertakings, mismanagement, unthriftiness, improvidence, poor crops, fall of prices, and other causes. Not a few who purchased land at war prices a few years ago found, when values had shrunk, that they were unable to meet the annual payments and saw their hard earned savings go to liquidate the claims of their creditors. Such cases were, however, rather the exception. The great majority of the tenants who purchased their farms, even at the high prices that prevailed for a few years after the close of the war, have been able to pay off their indebtedness and have become prosperous land-owners.

Reforms are needed in the land laws of some of the States. The relics of the old feudal arrangements often have too much force and prevent land-owners and others from dealing freely with the land. Some of the old doctrines in regard to landlord and tenant also require the attention of the legislators. Something ought without doubt or delay to be done to counteract and undo the bad results of the frauds and unwise grants of public lands. While care and some legislation are needed, the American people may very properly look with "more than Roman serenity" of mind on their land system which has contributed so much to their wealth, prosperity and strength.

DAVID BENNETT KING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DR. PAVY AND THE POLAR EXPEDITION.

THE people, both of America and Europe, have taken a deep interest in the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition. Accounts of this expedition, and of the one sent to its relief, as given by Commanders Schley and Soley of the U. S. Navy, and by Commander Greely and Lieutenant Lockwood of the U. S. Army, have been published. These accounts will be followed by other and important phases of its history. The complete story may never be told. Possibly, the interests of individuals who are a part of it, and even the policy of the government, will prevent the utterance of the whole truth. The papers of Dr. Octave Pavy—the surgeon and naturalist of the Polar Expedition—enable me to add to the published accounts some facts which cannot be spared.

An international Congress of scientists was held at Vienna, and later at St. Petersburg, in 1879 and '80. Several nations, among them America, pledged participation in the establishment of circumpolar meteorological stations. The object of the United States Government in locating the most northern station was the advancement of scientific knowledge by observations made in the region of and beyond Lady Franklin Bay, 81° 44′ N. latitude. Subsidiary to this purpose was the design to gain tidings of the lost "Jeannette," and to advance discovery on the Grinnell and Greenland coasts.

The Lady Franklin Bay Expedition consisted of twenty-five men from the United States Army, and the Signal Service Corps. Its executive officers were First Lieutenant Greely, commanding; Second Lieutenants Kislingbury and Lockwood; and the surgeon, Dr. Pavy, commissioned with the rank of first lieutenant. Sergeant D. L. Brainard was chief of the enlisted force. The vessel was the steamship "Proteus," chartered by the government to convey the expeditionary party from St. Johns, Newfoundland, to Lady Franklin Bay, where was established a meteorological station, the "Proteus" returning at once to Newfoundland. The colony was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

located on the 12th of August, 1881. Their settlement was named Fort Conger.

As the capacities accepted by Dr. Pavy, and the participation otherwise taken by him in the Polar Expedition, required peculiar experience and versatility, I must be pardoned, at this point, for giving a brief outline of the life and training which especially fitted him for the undertaking.

Dr. Pavy was an American, New Orleans being his native city. He was born in 1844. At a very early age he was sent to France to be educated, and became a graduate in science and art from the University of Paris. He pursued a course in medicine, for four years, under the Medical Faculty of Paris, and enjoyed the exceptional favor of daily friendship and association with the eminent surgeon Velpeau. A season of each year was devoted to travels on the Continent, in Great Britain, New Zealand, Iceland, Africa, and Australia. Many seasons were passed in Alpine travel, where glacial action, with natural history, in its various forms, was made a study. All the countries of Europe were visited during the course of his education, and, from practical observation and frequent travel on the seas, Dr. Pavy obtained a thorough insight into the laws of navigation. His exhaustive study of Arctic history, including research into every branch of science connected with life and exploration in the northern regions, made it possible for a scientific explorer to say of him : "He is versed in the history of every former explorer and exploration, and seems to know the history of every degree of latitude gained in the Arctic."

Within a few months of his graduation in medicine, a French Arctic expedition was proposed by the government. The distinguished scientist and explorer, Gustave Lambert, was placed in command, and Octave Pavy was appointed his chief executive associate. Strong interest was taken in the movement by the Emperor Napoleon, who personally donated to it 50,000 francs. At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, the project was necessarily abandoned. Lambert and Pavy entered the war. The former lost his life on the battle-field. M. Pavy became the captain of a French independent corps of infantry and cavalry, of which, as organizer, he assumed the command and expense. Associated with him in this enterprise were his friends, Lieutenant P. S. Beauregard, a nephew of General P. T. Beauregard, and the lamented French painter, Henri Regnault, who fell in battle at Captain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pavy's side. "This little army," said the London "Graphic," "was successful and useful, brave and daring."

In 1872 M. Pavy came to the United States to launch an individual interprise, which was called "The Pavy Expedition to the North Pole," the intended route being by the way of Bering Strait and Wrangel Land. This undertaking was heartily encouraged in France by the leading scientific minds. The French Geographical Society commended M. Pavy to the special consideration of the American Geographical Society, and the fellows of the various American Academies of Science. The Duke Alexis of Russia gave M. Pavy special encouragement, furnishing him with strong letters of recommendation to the officials of the various Siberian outposts, commanding their cordial co-operation. The American Geographical Society prepared a letter, commending Dr. Pavy and his "highly important expedition," to "all scientific societies, and to all governments throughout the world, for their aid and co-operation." The Academy of Science of his native city, New Orleans, commended him as "a gentlemen of high literary and scientific culture, of daring enterprise, and of great personal worth." The Arctic project for which Dr. Pavy had matured all plans, until within a few hours of departure from San Francisco, was suddenly brought to a close in June, 1872, by the death of his financial associate.

In 1879 correspondence passed between James Gordon Bennett and Dr. Pavy, relative to the doctor's engagement as surgeon of the "Jeannette" expedition. The United States Navy subsequently taking charge, its regulations excluded a civilian surgeon.

The United States Congress, in 1880, authorized an expedition to be fitted out by the army and navy, the vessel being furnished by a private individual.

Dr. Pavy was commissioned by the War Department to become its surgeon. The vessel proffered, the "Gulnare," was pronounced unseaworthy, and the army and navy withdrew from the undertaking, leaving it a private expedition. Leave of absence was granted Lieutenant G. C. Doane, U. S. A., who commanded this expedition. Dr. Pavy embarked in it as surgeon and naturalist. The voyage of the "Gulnare" toward the Arctic regions was discontinued at Godhavn, from which point she returned to the United States on account of unfitness for polar navigation, leaving Dr. Pavy to fulfill his intention to study and explore in that region.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

During the year he accompanied Mr. Smith, the royal inspector of North Greenland for Denmark, on his official journeys along the coast, as far north as Upernavik, and into the interior of Greenland. The doctor acquired the Eskimo language, familiarized himself with the habits of the natives, and made a study of the climatic influences, and the most effective mode of treating the diseases peculiar to the region. He made himself an adept, so far as a foreigner can become such, in the management of the Eskimo sledge—an acquirement upon which largely depends the security of life, and the safety of transportation, in the extreme North. He attained valuable insight into the sciences of the Arctic zone; made a study of the geological formations; of the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms. The fauna and flora were exhaustively studied, and, when collection was possible, classified. As a taxidermist, he made a comprehensive collection of the species of animal life of both land and sea, the collection being intended for the Smithsonian Institute. Dr. Pavy engaged the two Eskimos who accompanied the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition, and took great care in purchasing dried fish and walrus meat—food which in the Arctic regions is indispensable in keeping scurvy in abeyance. He purchased this anti-scurbutic food with great difficulty and much travel, but with the discrimination of a *savan* and the fidelity of a physician.

The steamship "Proteus," bearing the Polar Expedition under the command of Lieutenant A. W. Greely, while on the way from St. Johns to Lady Franklin Bay stopped at Godhavn, and took on board the surgeon, and the supplies which he had accumulated.

The experience and achievements of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition have been presented to the public in so many forms that I need not attempt to give any specific repetition of the story. From Fort Conger detachments of sledge-parties were sent out in different directions during the two years' life at the fort. Depots of provisions were established in the autumn and spring of the first year, as far north as Lincoln Bay, preparatory to sledge-travel northward later. Two attempts were made during the same year to reach Cape Joseph Henry, and land north of it; in both instances the party being turned back by open water, having made 83° N. latitude on one of the journeys.*

* Where Sir Geo. Nares found paleocrystic ice, Pavy and Rice found open sea.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the spring of 1882 the highest latitude was reached that has ever been attained by man (83° 24′ N; 40° 46′ W). The interior of Grinnell Land was penetrated in the spring and summer of 1882, resulting in the discovery of a large lake and a mountain chain. In the summer of '82 a southward journey was made, resulting in the discovery of an imposing valley, lying between Cape Baird and Cape Defosse. In the spring of '83 the western coast-line of Grinnell Land was reached, resulting in the discovery of the Western Sea. The party attained latitude 80° 47′, and longitude 88° 29′. Many other sledging journeys were made by the various members of the expedition, which, though unsuccessful in geographical results, were important in their bearing upon former theories, as leading to their verification or rejection. Fort Conger was abandoned by the expedition in August, 1883, the party taking with them a steam-launch, a whale-boat, and two towing boats. On the 10th of September the commander abandoned the launch and one boat, and later another boat. On the 29th land was reached, one boat remaining, a twelve-man sledge, and twenty-five days' rations. At Cape Sabine the final catastrophe took place. There, in consequence of official neglect in Washington and in the Arctic regions, the party were subjected to starvation, and the lives of nineteen men were needlessly sacrificed. The life of the surgeon closed sixteen days before rescue, which occurred on his birthday, June 22d.

It will be remembered that during the year following the departure of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition, a futile attempt was made by Lieutenant Beebe and the "Neptune" to reach them; and that, in the succeeding year, Lieutenant Garlington and the "Proteus" failed in a like attempt. The "Neptune" found impenetrable ice and returned, having reached Cape Isabella. The "Proteus" was wrecked a few miles north of Cape Sabine. The officers and crew, escaping in boats, returned to the United States.

The instructions of the Signal Service Bureau required that provisions should be left on the Greenland coast at Littleton Island, in Smith Sound. Fort Conger, the winter quarters of the Polar Expedition, were established on the Grinnell, not the Greenland coast. The objective point of the expedition, in making the southward retreat, according to official instructions given at Washington, was Littleton Island. Even in the face of starvation and death it was found impossible to obey these instructions. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

food was on the wrong side of the channel; and, although the distance was only eighteen miles, the death of more than three-quarters of the party was the result of the impracticability of crossing the channel between Cape Sabine and Littleton Island.

According to the testimony of the survivors, Dr. Pavy volunteered, while yet at Fort Conger, to make an advance retreat to Cape Sabine, going in April and returning in June, 1883. He suggested taking as companions Lieutenant Kislingbury, who urged the value of the retreat, and an Eskimo. Upon reaching Cape Sabine, records were to be *cached* in the name of Commander Greely, giving instructions that provisions should be left on that island, instead of at Littleton Island, across the dangerous, and possibly impassable channel. The offer made by Dr. Pavy was *declined* by the commanding officer.

Of this proposed retreat, Sergeant Brainard, since rescue, has said:

"Had Dr. Pavy made this noble advance march for us, every man in the party would to-day be alive. Not one would have suffered starvation."

Upon asking why the surgeon was not permitted to do what he considered of vital necessity, this was the answer:

"The commander wished to have further exploration on the west coast accomplished."

Much admiring comment has been made upon the retreat of the entire party in August, 1883, covering five hundred miles—about forty days of travel begun when the expectation of a relief ship in Discovery Harbor had been abandoned. Dr. Pavy offered not only to make the same journey, but to do so with two men, and return to Fort Conger, making a distance of more than one thousand miles. Had this advance retreat been made, records being left at Cape Sabine between the months of April and June, Lieutenant Garlington, who reached that point in July, and examined it, would, upon finding the cairn and its contents, have had a definite description of the whereabouts and the condition of the expeditionary party, and the course by which they could have been rescued, either by land or sea. Lieutenant Garlington not only landed where this record would have been found, but he left some few provisions near by, which were afterward devoured by the starving party. If the "Proteus" could not then have made her way to Lady Franklin Bay, or even to a lower latitude, one of two alternatives,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or both, would have followed, in accordance with the instructions given at Washington, which provided for the contingency "of the party not being able to reach the south by retreat, and for the sledges of the relief party to travel toward them." In short, if the records had been left by Pavy, as proposed, and found by Garlington, as would have resulted, the horrors of Cape Sabine would have been averted, Dr. Pavy would have been the savior of his party, and Lieutenant Garlington the rescuer. In that event the lives of nineteen men would have been spared, and the health of six survivors. All journals would have been returned. The scientific records would have been preserved intact, instead of mutilated. The "Proteus" and her cargo would have been saved. Many attacked and blighted reputations would have been spared, as well as millions of dollars to the government; and no blot would now rest upon the nation's record for leaving the men sent out at its command to starvation and death.

Under the supervision of the commanding officer an official map has been prepared, embodying the geographical results of the expedition, and purporting to outline its sledge journeys and discoveries. The various and important sledge journeys made by Dr. Pavy and Sergeant Rice, on one of which they attained 83° N. latitude, and the discovery by Dr. Pavy, later, of the valley lying between Cape Baird and Cape Defosse, are not outlined or named upon this map. Up to the present time all maps copied from this one have appeared without the name of Dr. Pavy in connection with his discovery, or the outlined sledge journeys of Pavy and Rice, in their Northern explorations. The maps found in the latest physical geographies, in the volume of Schley and Lanman, and the official maps, as well as several other publications, bear this unjust omission. Many alterations were made on the original map. In one instance the commander changed the name of his discovery of "Mount Chester A. Arthur" (named after the ex-President), to "Mount Arthur," referring to himself, the name Lieutenant Greely appearing in brackets. The map reveals its story of commission and omission. Numerous names appear on it —some of them the names of those who brought dire disaster upon the expedition—standing out boldly to remind us for all time of their culpable and cruel neglect.

Dr. Pavy's notes, to be presented, and other matter that will be published at a later day, were placed in my possession by the Sig-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nal Service Bureau of the United States. "Additional records" were reported "as due me" when these were delivered, and which I was told "to expect as soon as the official report was made." The statement has since been withdrawn by the same official source, the chief signal officer. No reason or explanation has been assigned to reconcile this official inconsistency. Certain letters and journals, private in character, which according to indisputable testimony were written by Dr. Pavy, must have been included in the "additional records" referred to.

During the years 1880 and '81, Dr. Pavy wrote a journal in South Greenland. This journal contained an account of numerous journeys along the coast and into the interior, and of the various studies which occupied his attention. A letter via the "Proteus," in 1881 informed me that it was taken by the doctor to Fort Conger, for revision, and would be brought to the United States by himself the next year, as he did not wish to remain longer with the party, as constituted. There being no government contract in 1880, the journal in question could not rightfully be retained in Washington even for copy. It was reported by the chief signal officer "to have been left in Greenland if written at all, as there were no papers of 1880 in the office." A more recent reply, from a subordinate officer, names the record of 1880 in the inventory of papers held in the office.

From 1881 to '83 memoranda were made, and pages intended for a book were written, during three years' life at Fort Conger, each page marked by Dr. Pavy "My Book." I possess but a dozen pages of this book, though hundreds of pages were written. Most of these are upon glacial action, and contain the most exact and carefully prepared writing of which Docter Pavy is author.

Between August, 1883, and June, 1884 (the month of his death), Dr. Pavy kept an occasional journal. This record is reported as "missing," in addition to all private journals and letters, written during three years' absence. The latter papers the doctor himself described in official communication both to the commander and the Surgeon-General, U. S. Army, in the following words: "A journal destitute of any official value, a mere record of events, hypotheses and reminiscences, closely mingled with personal and intimate thoughts; sentiments from detached notes, and reduced into letters of an entirely private character, intended only for the use of my family." The letter embodying this description, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

addressed to the Surgeon-General, was never seen by that officer until I forwarded to him copies of various official documents.

According to the testimony of a survivor, there were three sealed boxes marked as the property of Dr. Pavy, and known as such before and after his death. By the same survivor they were seen unchanged and still labeled, on ship-board, when he was on the way to the United States, after rescue. One box only of these three has been officially reported by the chief signal officer. Dr. Pavy specified their contents in these words: "In my boxes are all the official and private papers that I have possessed since leaving the United States—from 1880 to '84. Except the official letters, the papers are chiefly of a private character." Among the memoranda delivered to me from Washington, there is not a line or a page having the nature of a personal or private communication, with one exception—a single mutilated page. The fate of the two boxes not reported to me, and of the contents, as previously enumerated, is yet involved in mystery. Records were both lost and injured at Cape Sabine, during the rescue of the party. Injury occurred to those records of the surgeon's which have since come into my hands. Such a fate might also have caused injury to the so-called "missing records;" but their *disappearance* occurred after leaving Cape Sabine. On reaching New York, the records were delivered to the chief signal officer. The onus of their disappearance rests with him.

According to official regulation, it was expected that the surgeon's medical records would be referred to the medical division of the War Department. Finding, in his papers, letters addressed to the Surgeon-General, in which Dr. Pavy states important facts, and demands investigation into his conduct, because of unjust charges in writing against him, I applied for judgment upon the case, and received official information from the Surgeon-General that there were no records on file in his office relating to the matter other than that Dr. Pavy was contracted with as surgeon.

The commanding officer relieved Dr. Pavy from his duties as naturalist in June, 1883. The surgeon had no contract papers for any department save the medical. The duties of naturalist were assumed by request of the commander, without expectation of pay. According to the testimony of the survivors, those duties were ably and satisfactorily performed; and an official circular of the commander (June, 1883) refers to the "zeal and good results of work

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in this direction during the years 1881 and '82." The survivors further testify that "Lieutenant Lockwood to whom the duties were transferred, was not qualified to perform them," and that "after the doctor was deprived of that capacity there was little work of consequence done in that line." They add that "the doctor's collection of natural history, made in 1880 in South Greenland, and from '81 to '83 at Fort Conger, was boxed well, and will probably be found intact at Discovery Harbor, by some future expedition."

In July, 1883, Dr. Pavy presented his resignation as surgeon, still offering his services to the party, but wishing to sever himself, as a survivor said, "from all official connection with the commander." The following is an extract from the surgeon's contract in my possession, and shows his rank, and for how long a time his contract, without renewal, bound him: "Surgeon of the rank of first lieutenant. This contract to continue at least one year, if not sooner determined by the officer commanding the military expedition, or the Surgeon-General."

It would have been culpable in the surgeon to have severed himself from the moral obligation to serve a party dependent upon him. But Dr. Pavy by no means took this step; and his own official words forever refute the charge made by the commander, and place it upon the ground of deliberate and willful falsehood. On the contrary, the surgeon, in his resignation expressly said: "As a matter of course I offer my services to the expedition, and declare myself willing and ready to perform the same duties as in the past, still devoting myself to the welfare and success of our undertaking; but will desire, as in the past, to have full control of the medical stores and instruments, for which I consider myself responsible. I believe the exclusion of this clause, in our present circumstances, to be incompatible with the dignity of the profession." The surgeon, thereafter, officially declined to surrender the medical stores and instruments to any one unable to use or care for them. Had Dr. Pavy so far forgotten the supremacy of right and duty, which he owed first, through professional dignity, to the Medical Department, as to surrender his medical equipments to an unprofessional junior officer, or to any but a medical man, the commander would have been obliged, at once, to revoke his despotic order, in case of scurvy, fracture, or even tooth-pulling, in order that a physcian might render relief. Forgetting neither duty nor

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dignity, the surgeon, in the face of charges and arrest, declined to surrender his medical stores and his private journal. This declination, made July 19, 1883, was followed by official charges and specifications against Dr. Pavy, and resulted in an order of arrest, and confinement to limits. At the moment of arrest Dr. Pavy said: "I accept the arrest physically but not morally."

The surgeon claimed his right and duty to express his professional opinion, in the face of difference and opposition. The expression of this medical opinion, given for the highest welfare of the party, was declared by the commander to be "subversive to discipline." By official communication, thereafter to the commander and the Surgeon-General, Dr. Pavy demanded that upon his return to the United States, "investigation should be opened on his conduct of the Medical Department."

Regarding his resignation and arrest, three of the survivors have said: "Dr. Pavy had been under arrest nearly a year at the time of his death. The order read that he was to be confined to limits within one mile of the camp. Dr. Pavy was a civilian surgeon, his time ran out, and he refused to serve under the orders of Lieutenant Greely. He was an enthusiastic Arctic explorer, and knew better than any man in the party what to expect in the frozen zone. He was a grand, good man, and, if he had lived, the inside story of the Greely Expedition would have been told before now. The men regarded him as their hero. He was always doing something for the command, and was one of its hardest workers."

The life of Dr. Pavy was sacrificed. But a part, at least, of his records remain to speak for him. His memoranda were made in French. The official letters are in English. The notes which will appear later were translated by Mr. George Wilson, A.M., of Lexington, Missouri, who has made affidavit of their accuracy. It is well understood that a scientist or student notes many points of interest and importance in a book of memoranda, which he would subsequently enlarge upon, discard, or modify. I am well aware that a few detached notes are a meager representation of the labors of a scientist for four years, as compared with official and private records of fuller detail and greater value, which are not in my possession, and are denied me. Yet these notes, though necessarily presented in detached form, and under many disadvantages, cannot fail to mirror, to any candid mind, the sur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

geon's fidelity to his profession, his courageous adherence to conviction, and his accurate discernment of future events, which foreshadowed disaster, and impelled him to perform his duty in the face of opposition, and to give warning even when it was proffered in vain.

LILLA MAY PAVY.

[*To be Concluded.*]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

UNPUBLISHED WAR LETTERS BY GENERALS GRANT AND HALLECK.

I.

RECENT discussions have aroused wide-spread interest in the question of the real relations which existed between Generals Grant and Halleck during the war. The controversy has been precipitated by the acknowledged friends of Grant. These rest their whole case upon the reports which General Halleck felt obliged to send to Washington, in regard to General Grant, immediately after the fall of Fort Donelson. The friends of General Halleck are understood to take the ground that to have done anything less than he did do, would have been a grave neglect of duty; that immediately afterward, instead of seeking to make trouble for General Grant, he interfered actively to save him from trouble; and that their relations were very friendly subsequently, and throughout the war. Friends of General Halleck are known to hold, further, that General Grant's final belief that General Halleck had been unfriendly to him at that time was created by subordinates, who, for purposes of their own, distorted the contents of the official records. It is still further claimed by them that no true friend of General Grant can contemplate with pleasure a discussion which, if continued, must and should result in establishing the exact facts of the whole situation during the ten days following the fall of Donelson.

The letter books which contain the originals of the private correspondence which passed between these two generals during the war have been examined by a communicator of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. The cordial relations which existed between these officers appear throughout the volumes in many direct utterances, while nothing is found, after the cloud that fell at Donelson was dispelled, to show the least jar between them in the course of a necessarily voluminous correspondence extending over three years and a half. One or two brief extracts from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letters herewith presented have had a limited circulation before, but with these exceptions the subjoined compilation is new.

II.

When General Grant was still restive under his anomalous position of "Second in Command" after Shiloh, General Halleck wrote him:

HALLECK TO GRANT.

"MONTEREY, MISS., *May* 12, 1862.

. . . "I am very much surprised, general, that you should find any cause of complaint in the recent assignments of commands. You have precisely the position to which your rank entitles you. Had I given you the right wing, or reserve only, it would have been a reduction rather than increase of command, and I could not give you both without placing you in the position you now occupy.

"You certainly will not suspect me of any intention to injure your feelings or reputation, or to do you any injustice; if so, you will eventually change your mind on this subject. For the last three months I have done everything in my power to ward off the attacks which were made upon you. If you believe me your friend you will not require explanation; if not, explanations on my part would be of little avail."

Fifteen months later, the correspondence shows the existence of most cordial relations. The following letter from General Halleck is interesting in the friendliness of its address, and in the wish, expressed at its close, to be back with Grant in the field. General Meade's friends will read it with much pleasure. It further shows that Halleck suggested the letter from Grant, in which he so cordially recommended Sherman and McPherson for promotion, while, at the same time, Grant's warm friendship for these comrades shines out in every line of his compliance with Halleck's wish:

III.

"HEAD-QUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
"WASHINGTON, D. C., *July* 11, 1863.

"MAJOR-GENERAL GRANT, *Vicksburg, Miss.*

"*My dear General:* General George C. Meade has been appointed a brigadier-general in the regular army, at the same time that you were made a major-general. There is still one vacant brigadier-generalcy, and I hope that Harney, Anderson and Cooke will soon be retired, making three more vacancies.

"The most prominent persons, as candidates for brigadier-general in the regular army, are W. T. Sherman, McPherson, G. H. Thomas, Sedgwick and Hancock. I am of opinion that Sherman and McPherson have rendered the best service, and should come in first. If you think so, write an official letter to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that effect, urging their appointment to the first vacancies. State their services pretty fully, and mention the battles they have been in under your command. The feeling is very strong here in favor of your generals.

"We are anxiously waiting to hear of the fall of Port Hudson, and the entire opening of the Mississippi River. The President will then issue a general order congratulating the armies of the East and West on their recent victories.

"This consideration has prevented me from issuing one myself for your army. I preferred that it should come from the President.

"Meade has thus far proved an excellent general, the only one, in fact, who has ever fought the Army of the Potomac well. He seems the right man in the right place. Hooker was more than a failure. Had he remained in command he would have lost the army and the Capitol.

"Give my kindest regards to my old friends among your officers. I sincerely wish I was with you again in the West. I am utterly sick of this political hell.

"Yours truly

"H. W. HALLECK."

IV.

Upon receiving the above, General Grant promptly wrote President Lincoln the following cordial and generous letter:

GRANT TO LINCOLN.

"HEAD-QUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF TENNESSEE,
"VICKSBURG, MISS., *July* 22, 1863.

"HIS EXCELLENCY, A. LINCOLN,

"*President of the United States,*

"Washington, D. C.:

"I would most respectfully but urgently recommend the promotion of Major-General W. T. Sherman, now commanding the Fifteenth Army Corps, and Major-General J. B. McPherson, commanding the Seventeenth Army Corps, to the position of brigadier-general in the regular army. The first reason for this is their great fitness for any command it may ever become necessary to intrust to them. Second, their great purity of character and disinterestedness in anything except the faithful performance of their duty, and the success of every one engaged in the great battle for the preservation of the Union. Third, they have honorably won this distinction upon many well fought battle-fields. I will only mention some of his services while serving under my command.

[After setting forth the services of each, and at every stage awarding high praise, General Grant closes with respect to General Sherman as follows:]

"The siege of Vicksburg, the last capture of Jackson, and the dispersion of Johnston's army entitle General Sherman to more credit than it usually falls to the lot of one man to earn.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In closing the account of General McPherson's services, the letter continues:

"In the assault of the 22d May on the fortifications of Vicksburg, and during the entire siege, General McPherson and his command won unfading laurels. He is one of our ablest engineers and most skillful generals.

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"U. S. GRANT, *Major-General.*"

V.

Three weeks later, General Grant, in the midst of a long letter to General Halleck, on official business, turned aside from the thread of the letter to write:

GRANT TO HALLECK.

"VICKSBURG, MISS., *Aug.* 11, 1863.

. . . "I feel under many obligations to you, general, for the interest you have ever taken in my welfare, and that of the army I have the honor to command. I will do the best I know how to satisfy you that your confidence has not been misplaced." . . .

VI.

A few weeks later Halleck was thus privately defending Grant to Secretary Stanton:

HALLECK TO STANTON.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *Nov.* 15, 1863.

. . . "It has been alleged, and the allegation has been widely circulated by the press, that General Grant, in the conduct of his campaign, positively disobeyed the instructions of his superiors. It is hardly necessary to remark that General Grant never disobeyed an order or instruction, but always carried out, to the best of his ability, every wish or suggestion made to him by the Government; moreover, he has never complained that the Government did not furnish him all the means and assistance in its power to facilitate the execution of any plan which he saw fit to adopt."

VII.

When the war closed, Halleck is found prompt to extend, and Grant prompt to accept, the hospitality of the former's home. The following telegrams tell of the incident:

STANTON TO HALLECK.

"WASHINGTON, *May* 17, 9 P.M., 1865.

"MAJOR-GENERAL HALLECK: General Grant is here with his wife and is sick. It is not safe for him to be at the hotel, and he is reluctant to go into a private family. He would go into your house for a while, if agreeable to you. Will you write him to do so while your family are absent?

"E. M. STANTON, *Secretary of War.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VIII.

HALLECK TO GRANT.

"RICHMOND, VA., *May*, 1865.

"LIEUT.-GENERAL GRANT, *Washington:*

"There are two servants, and most of the furniture and bedding in the house I occupied in Georgetown. I suggest that while your wife is with you you move right in and make yourself comfortable, My family will not again occupy it, and I do not require the furniture here, at least for the present. During the hot weather you can make yourself much more comfortable there than in Washington.

"H. W. HALLECK, *Major-General.*"

IX.

GRANT TO HALLECK.

"WASHINGTON, *May* 18, 3 P.M., 1865.

"MAJOR-GENERAL HALLECK: Your very kind dispatch placing your house at Mrs. Grant's disposal during her stay is received. I have not seen Mrs. Grant, but I know that she will be delighted to get out of the hotel for the few weeks she remains here.

"U. S. GRANT, *Lieutenant-General.*"

In the Halleck collection is Grant's first private report about General McClernand, also indicating the early opinion of Admiral Porter about this subject:

X.

GRANT TO HALLECK.

"MEMPHIS, TENN., *January* 20, 1863.

. . . "I would respectfully ask if it would not be policy to combine the four departments in the West under one commander. As I am the senior department commander in the West, I will state that I have no desire whatever for such combined command, but would prefer the command I now have to any other that can be given.

"I regard it as my duty to state that I found there was not sufficient confidence felt in General McClernand as a commander, either by the army or navy, to insure his success. Of course all would co-operate to the best of their ability, but still with a distrust.

"This is a matter I made no inquiries about, but it was forced upon me. As it is my intention to command in person, unless otherwise directed, there is no special necessity of mentioning this matter, but I want you to know that others besides myself agree in the necessity of the course I had already determined upon pursuing.

"Admiral Porter told me that he had written freely to the Secretary of the Navy on this subject, with the request that what he said might be shown to the Secretary of War. . . .

"Very respectfully,

"U. S. GRANT, *Major-General, Commanding.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The extremes of opinion about General Rosecrans appear in three letters, one written in 1862, and the others two years later. The third letter from General Grant expresses a decided opinion of Generals Curtis, Crocker and Sheridan :

XI.

"CORINTH, *August* 9, 1862.

. . . "I am anxious to keep the whole of the Army of the Mississippi together, and under the command of Brigadier-General Rosecrans, ready for any emergency, either to move upon any force that may threaten my front, or to reinforce General Buell. Having so many major-generals to provide commands for, this may be difficult. I regret that General Rosecrans has not got rank equal to his merit to make this easy." . . .

XII.

"CITY POINT, VA., *November* 30, 1864.

"I have just dispatched to you requesting that the Department of 'the Northwest,' Missouri and Kansas, be erected into a military division, and that General Pope be assigned to the command. I think it is highly essential that the territory embraced in those three departments should all be under one head. The importance of this change is much increased because of the inefficiency of two of the commanders of departments named, one of whom, I suppose, cannot well be removed. I do, however, think it of very great importance that General Rosecrans should be removed.

"There is no fault with General Canby that induces me to recommend a curtailment of his command, but being at such a distance from Missouri, he cannot direct affairs there as well as it can be done from Washington.

"I wish you would lay this matter before the Secretary of War and urge that the change be immediately made. With Pope in command we secure at least two advantages we have not heretofore had, namely, subordination and intelligence of administration."

XIII.

"CITY POINT, VA., *June* 24, 1864.

"Your letter stating that Generals Rosecrans and Curtis are calling for more troops is received. I am satisfied you would hear the same call if they were stationed in Maine. The fact is the two departments should be merged into one, and some officer, who does not govern so largely through a secret police system as Rosecrans does, put in command. I do think the best interests of the service demands that Rosecrans should be removed and some one else placed in that command. It makes but little difference who you assign, it would be an improvement. I had suspected wrong management on the Mississippi River, but believed Washburne and Slocum would purify matters, so far as their commands and their powers go. Have they not done so?

"You ask if the resignation of General Crocker should be accepted, and if he is qualified for the command of New Mexico. Crocker and Sheridan, I think, were the best division commanders I have ever known. Either of them are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

qualified for any command. I would say, by all means retain General Crocker in the service, and send him to New Mexico. The only available major-general I can think of to take the Department of the Missouri, if the President will consent to the change, and I hope he will, is N. J. T. Dana."

Some letters about General C. S. Hamilton set forth General Grant's sharp views of an officer's duty, and incidentally express opinions of Generals McPherson and Hurlburt.

XIV.

"BEFORE VICKSBURG, *March* 24, 1863.

"I am led to believe, and think there is no doubt of the fact, that Major-General C. S. Hamilton is making indirect efforts to get General McPherson removed from the command of his army corps and to get the command himself. If this is so I wish to enter my solemn protest.

"There is no comparison between the two as to their fitness for such a command.

"McPherson from his activity, good sense, winning manners and efforts to harmonize all parts of his command toward each other, and preserve the same harmony toward all parts of this army, has made him the favorite with his men and officers, and one of the most suitable corps commanders probably in any service. General Hamilton lacks these qualifications. As a soldier I have no fault to find with him further than his natural jealous disposition which influences his military conduct and acts prejudicially upon the service.

"I inclose with this some correspondence between Generals Hurlburt and Hamilton, and which forms part of the ground upon which I have felt it a duty to order the latter to the front, and show partially the justness of what I here say of him.

"I would respectfully ask to have this laid before the President."

XV.

GRANT TO L. THOMAS, ADJUTANT-GENERAL.

"BEFORE VICKSBURG, *March* 28, 1863.

"Inclosed with this I send you the resignation of Major-General C. S. Hamilton, out of form mostly, giving the reason for tendering it.

"It is due that I should state that I have approved this resignation for the following reasons: I saw by the correspondence of the two generals that General Hamilton and General Hurlburt could not get along together. For this reason I relieved the former from duty in the District of West Tennessee and ordered him here. Commanders having been assigned to corps by the President I had nothing larger in the field to give General Hamilton than a division. This he refused to accept.

"General Hamilton being a capable officer, I gave him the choice between taking his old position under General Hurlburt, a division in the field, the command of the District of Eastern Arkansas, or to be relieved from duty in this department and ordered to report to Washington for orders. He accepted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the latter, with the request that his resignation be forwarded. I think in justice to the service his resignation should be accepted. The officer who shows that he expects a command fixed up for his express benefit, in my opinion becomes a beneficiary instead of what he should be, a support to the Government. The proposition which General Hamilton said he could accept were first, a division of General Hurlburt's command, in a certain way, and he to be independent of the latter; the other that I take two divisions of the army in the field and give him independent of army corps commanders. This I could not do without manifest injury to the service."

XVI.

A letter in regard to the use of colored troops has points of interest.

GRANT TO HALLECK.

"MILIKENS BEND, La., *April* 19, 1863.

. . . "At least three of my army corps commanders take hold of the new policy of arming the negroes and using them against the rebels with a will. They at least are so much of soldiers as to feel themselves under obligations to carry out a policy which they would not inaugurate, in the same good faith, and with the same zeal ,as if it was of their own devising. You may rely on my carrying out any policy ordered by proper authority to the best of my ability."

It has often been claimed by writers about General Grant that he devised the brilliant plan for opening the Tennessee River below Chattanooga, which relieved the army of the Cumberland.

In the following letter of General Grant, he writes that, on his arrival he found General Thomas ready to execute this plan which had, been already prepared. It will be remembered by all familiar with the reports of the battles about Chattanooga, that General Thomas, in turn, reported that the plan had really been prepared under General Rosecrans before the latter was relieved by General Thomas:

XVII.

"CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *October* 26, 1863.

"I arrived there in the night of the 23d inst., after a ride on horseback of fifty miles from Bridgeport, over the worst roads it is possible to conceive of, and through a continous drenching rain. It is now clear, and so long as it continues so it is barely possible to supply this army from its present base. . . .

"General Thomas had also set on foot before my arrival a plan for getting possession of the river from a point below Lookout Mountain to Bridgeport. If successful, and I think it will be, the question of supplies will be fully settled." . . .

General Grant's letters increased in interest after he assumed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

command at the East. This one about General Butler is interesting:

XVIII.

"CITY POINT VA., *July* 1, 1864.

"Mr Dana, Assistant Secretary of War, has just returned. He informs me that he called attention to the necessity of sending General Butler to another field of duty. Whilst I have no difficulty with General Butler, finding him always clear in his conception of orders, and prompt to obey, yet there is a want of knowledge how to execute, and particularly a prejudice against him as a commander, that operates against his usefulness. I have feared that it might become necessary to separate him and General Smith. The latter is really one of the most efficient officers in the service, readiest in expedients and most skillful in the management of troops in action. I would dislike removing him from his present command unless it was to increase it, but, as I say, *may have it to do yet, if General Butler remains.*

"As an administrative officer General Butler has no superior. In taking charge of a department where there are no great battles to be fought, but a dissatisfied element to control, no one could manage it better than he. If a command could be cut out, such as Mr. Dana proposed, namely, Kentucky, Illinois and Indiana, or if the departments of the Missouri, Kansas, and the States of Illinois and Indiana could be merged together, and General Butler put over it, I believe the good of the service would be subserved.

"I regret the necessity of asking for a change in commanders here, but General Butler not being a soldier of education and experience, is in the hands of his subordinates in the execution of all operations military. I would feel strengthened with Smith, Franklin, or J. J. Reynolds commanding the right wing of this army. At the same time, as I have here stated, General Butler has always been prompt in his obedience to orders, with me, and clear in his understanding of them. I would not, therefore, be willing to recommend his retirement.

"I send this by mail for consideration, but will telegraph if I think it absolutely necessary to make a change."

A note about a request from Mrs. General McClellan shows the kindly side of Grant:

XIX.

"CITY POINT, VA., *December* 26, 1864.

"I am just in receipt of a letter from General G. B. McClellan, saying that he purposes visiting Europe soon, with his family, and that Mrs. McClellan desires to see her father before starting, and requests a leave of absence for Colonel Marcy that this desire may be gratified. I do not know the special duty Colonel Marcy may be on at this time, and do not therefore wish to order the leave granted lest it may interfere with important duties. If not inconsistent with public service, however, I wish this leave to be granted from Washington. Colonel Marcy, I believe, is in Memphis, Tenn., at this time."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The dispatch, below, indicates how closely General Grant looked after details :

XX.

GRANT TO MAJOR-GENERAL A. E. HITCHCOCK.

[*Telegram.*] "CITY POINT, VA., 10:30 P.M., *February* 16, 1865.

"I see it stated in the papers, that where some prisoners in the West were paroled to be sent forward for exchange, those who preferred Northern prisons to a return to the rebel service, were invited to step to the front. I think this wrong. Those who do not wish to go back are the ones whom it is most desirable to exchange. If they do not wish to serve in the rebel army, they can return to us after exchange and avoid it."

The following has some additional views on the questions which daily arose in the exchange of prisoners :

XXI.

GRANT TO HALLECK.

"CITY POINT, VA., *February* 18, 1865.

"Your communication of the 15th inst. with inclosure, calling my attention to the fact that advantage is being taken by General Beall, Confederate agent, of the recent agreement between Judge Ould and myself, to supply rebel prisoners with new uniforms and blankets, is received. The arrangement for the relief of prisoners of war was made at a time when exchanges could not be made, and under it I see no way to prevent rebel prisoners from being clothed. Having, however, a very large excess of prisoners over the enemy, we can, in making exchanges, select those who have not been furnished with new clothing or blankets. By this means but a very limited number of rebel soldiers will be returned with new uniforms. Should it become necessary, prisoners for exchange can be required to turn their blankets over to their comrades who remain.

"Please give orders to General Hoffman accordingly."

This about General Gilmore will be read with surprise by the friends of that officer :

XXII.

GRANT TO STANTON.

"CITY POINT, VA., *February* 26, 1865.

"I regretted greatly when I learned that General Gilmore had been assigned to the command of the Department of the South. He probably will be a suitable officer to have the general superintendence of the fortifications on the seacoast. But, on that duty, he should be required to have all his requisitions approved by General Delafield or he will expend too much.

"Foreseeing the fall of Charleston, I sent orders to General Gilmore, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advance of hearing of the events, to occupy the necessary points on the coast for us to hold, with minimum garrisons, and send the balance of his forces to the Cape Fear River, and to send all white troops, leaving the colored ones where they have been raised and where their families are. Before he received that order I suppose he sent a letter calling for from 4,000 to 5,000 more troops, 1,000 mounted men, with which he expects, by uniting the civil with the military, to feed and foster the Union sentiment in Georgia. I feel confident that, with Terry in command of that department, instead of wanting an addition to his force, he will spare 1,000 men to be used elsewhere, and the balance will be much more economically supported and usefully employed. He will administer the affairs of his department with sense and judgment, and will not talk about expeditions and conquests where there is no enemy to oppose him. He will also prove a most excellent man to organize colored troops."

The two letters which follow are of great interest. In the first, which is not new, General Grant suggests the abandonment of all the northern lines to Richmond, and the opening from the coast of a base as far south as Raleigh. General Halleck's reply, which is new, in addition to the general discussion of the questions, contains many facts in regard to the real condition of the army of the Potomac, and generally of the Eastern armies, with respect to their strength for offensive purposes, which were wholly unknown at the time, and which would have startled the country had they then come to light :

XXIII.

GRANT TO HALLECK.

(Confidential.) "NASHVILLE, TENN., *January* 19, 1864.

"MAJOR-GENERAL H. W. HALLECK, *Washington, D. C.:*

"I would respectfully suggest whether an abandonment of all previously attempted lines to Richmond is not advisable, and in lieu of these, one to be taken further south. I would suggest Raleigh, N. C., as the objective point, and Suffolk as the starting point. Raleigh once secured, I would make Newberne the base of supplies until Wilmington is secured. A moving force of sixty thousand men would probably be required to start on such an expedition. This force would not have to be increased unless Lee should withdraw from his present position. In that case the necessity for so large a force on the Potomac would not exist. A force moving from Suffolk would destroy, first, all the roads about Weldon, or even as far north as Hicksford. From Weldon to Raleigh they would scarcely meet with serious opposition. Once there, the most interior line of railway still left to the enemy—in fact, the only one they would then have—would be so threatened as to force him to use a large portion of his army in guarding it. This would virtually force an evacuation of Virginia, and indirectly of East Tennessee. It would throw our armies into new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fields, where they could partially live upon the country, and would reduce the stores of the enemy. It would cause thousands of North Carolina troops to desert and return to their homes. It would give us possession of many negroes who are now indirectly aiding the rebellion. It would draw the enemy from campaigns of their own choosing, and for which they are prepared, to new lines of operations never expected to become necessary. It would effectually blockade Wilmington, the post now of more value to the enemy than all the balance of their sea coast. It would enable operations to commence at once by removing the war to a more southern climate instead of months of inactivity in winter quarters. Other advantages might be cited, which would be likely to grow out of this plan, but these are enough. From your better opportunities of studying the country and the armies, that would be involved in this plan, you will be better able to judge of the practicability of it than I possibly can.

"I have written this in accordance with what I understood to be an invitation from you to express my views about military operations, and not to insist that any plan of mine should be carried out. Whatever course is agreed upon, I shall always believe is at least intended for the best, and until fully tested will hope to have it prove so.

"U. S. GRANT, *Major-General.*"

XXIV.

HALLECK TO GRANT.

(Confidential.) "WASHINGTON, D. C., *February* 17, 1864.

"LIEUT.-GENERAL U. S. GRANT, *Nashville, Tenn.:*

"GENERAL: Your letter of the 12th inst. is just received. I fully concur with you in regard to the present condition of affairs in East Tennessee. It certainly is very much to be regretted that the fatal mistake of General Burnside has permitted Longstreet's army to winter in Tennessee. It is due to yourself that a full report of the matter should be placed on file so that the responsibily may rest where it properly belongs.

"The condition of affairs in East Tennessee, and the uncertainty of General Bank's operations in Texas and Lousiana, have caused me to delay answering your former communications in regard to operations of the next campaign. In one of these, you suggest whether it might not be well not to attempt anything more against Richmond, and send a column of sixty thousand men into North Carolina.

"In the first place, I have never considered Richmond as the necessary objective point of the Army of the Potomac: that point is *Lee's army.* I have never supposed that Richmond could be taken till Lee's army was defeated or driven away. It was one of Napoleon's maxims that an army covering a capital must be destroyed before attempting to capture or occupy that capital. And now how can we best defeat Lee's army; by attacking it between here and Richmond, on our shortest line of supplies and in such a position that we can combine our whole force, or by a longer line and with a force diminished by the troops required to cover Washington and Maryland?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The movement through North Carolina, alluded to by you, and also one from Port Royal on Savannah and into Georgia, have been several times suggested here and pretty fully discussed by military men. It is conceded, by those suggesting these expeditions, that neither of them can be safely undertaken with a less force than that estimated by you, viz., sixty thousand effective men. Some require a still larger force.

"If we admit the advantage of either of these plans, the question immediately arises, Where can we get the requisite number of troops? There is evidently a general public misconception of the strength of our army in Virginia and about Washington. Perhaps it is good policy to encourage this public error. The entire effective force in the fortifications about Washington, and employed in guarding the public buildings and stores, the aqueduct, and railroads, does not exceed eighteen thousand men. We have a few thousand more in the convalescent and distribution camps, and in the cavalry and artillery depots; but these mostly fragments of organizations temporarily here for equipment and distribution, and could contribute very little to the defense of the place. This force is, therefore, less than one-half of what General McClellan and several boards of officers recommend as the permanent garrison. Considering the political importance of Washington and the immense amount of military stores here, it would be exceedingly hazardous to reduce it still further.

"The effective force of the army of the Potomac is only about seventy thousand. General Meade retreated before Lee with a very much larger force, and does not now deem himself strong enough to attack Lee's present army. Suppose we were to send thirty thousand men from that army to North Carolina, would not Lee be able to make another invasion of Maryland and Pennsylvania? But it may be said that, by operating in North Carolina, we would compel Lee to move his army there. I do not think so. Uncover Washington and the Potomac River, and all the forces which Lee can collect will be moved North, and the popular sentiment will compel the Government to bring back the army in North Carolina to defend Washington, Baltimore, Harrisburg, and Philadelphia. I think Lee would to-morrow exchange Richmond and Raleigh and Wilmington for the possession of either of the afore-mentioned cities.

"But suppose it were practicable to send thirty thousand men from Meade's army to North Carolina, where shall he get the other thirty thousand? We have there now barely enough to hold the points which it is necessary to occupy in order to prevent contraband trade. Very few of these would be available for the field. Maryland is almost entirely stripped of troops, and the forces in West Virginia are barely sufficient to protect that part of the country from rebel raids. The only other resource is South Carolina.

"Generals Foster and Gillmore were both of opinion, at the commencement of operations against Charleston, that neither that place nor Savannah could be taken by a land force of less than 60,000 men. But the Navy Department was sanguine that the iron-clads could reduce Charleston if the army would disable Fort Sumter and the island batteries. A large land and naval force have been employed there for nearly a year without any important result. I had no faith

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the plan at first, and for months past have ineffectually urged that ten or fifteen thousand men from Gillmore's command be sent against Texas or Mobile. And now these troops are sent upon another expedition which, in my opinion, can produce no military result.

"I always have been, and am still opposed, to all of these isolated expeditions on the sea and gulf coasts. It is true that they greatly assist the navy in maintaining the blockade and preventing contraband trade, but I think the troops so employed would do more good if concentrated on some important line of military operations. We have given too much attention to cutting the toenails of our enemy instead of grasping his throat.

"You will perceive, from the facts stated above, that there are serious, if not insurmountable obstacles in the way of the proposed North Carolina expedition. Nevertheless, as it has much to recommend it, I shall submit it, with your remarks, to the consideration of the President and Secretary of War, as soon as troops enough return from furlough to attempt any important movement in this part of the theatre of war.

"Lee's army is by far the best in the rebel service, and I regard him as their ablest general. But little progress can be made here until that army is broken or defeated. There have been several good opportunities to do this, viz., at Antietam, at Chancellorsville, and at Williamsport, in the retreat from Gettysburg. I am also of opinion that General Meade could have succeeded recently at Mine Run, had he persevered in his attack.

"The overthrow of Lee's army being the object of operations here, the question arises, How can we best attain it? If we fight that army with our communications open to Washington so as to cover this place and Maryland, we can concentrate upon it nearly all of our forces on this frontier; but if we operate by North Carolina or the Peninsula, we must act with a divided army, and on exterior lines, while Lee, with a short interior line can concentrate his entire force upon either fragment.

"And yet, if we had troops enough to secure our position here, and at the same time to operate with advantage on Raleigh or Richmond, I would not hesitate to do so, at least for a winter or spring campaign. But our numbers are not sufficient, in my opinion, to attempt this, at least for the present. Troops sent south of James River cannot be brought back in time to oppose Lee, should he attempt a movement north, which I am satisfied would be his best policy.

"Our main efforts in the next campaign should unquestionably be made against the armies of Lee and Johnston. But by what particular lines we shall operate cannot be positively determined until the affairs of East Tennessee are settled, and we can know more nearly what force can be given to the Army of the Potomac. In the mean time it will be well to compare views and opinions. The final decision of this question will probably depend, under the President, upon yourself.

"It may be said that, if General McClellan failed to take Richmond by the Peninsula route, so also have Generals Burnside, Hooker and Meade failed to accomplish that object by the shorter and more direct route. This is all very true, but no argument can be deduced from the bare fact in favor of either plan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of operations. General McClellan had so large an army in the spring of 1862 that possibly he was justified in directing his forces and adopting exterior lines of operations. If he had succeeded his plan would have been universally praised. He failed. And so also have Burnside, Hooker and Meade on an interior route; but their armies were far inferior in number to that which McClellan had two years ago. These facts in themselves prove nothing in favor of either route, and to decide the question we must recur to fundamental principles in regard to interior and exterior lines, objective points, covering armies, divided forces, etc., etc. These fundamental principles require, in my opinion, that all our available forces in the East should be concentrated against Lee's army. We cannot take Richmond (at least with any military advantage) and we cannot operate advantageously on any point from the Atlantic coast, till we destroy or disperse that army. And the nearer to Washington we can fight it the better for us. We can here, or between here and Richmond, concentrate against him more men than anywhere else. If we cannot defeat him here with our combined forces, we cannot hope to do so elsewhere with a divided army.

"I write to you plainly and frankly, for between us there should be no reserve or concealment of opinions. As before remarked, I presume that, under the authority of the President, the final decision of these questions will be referred to you. Nevertheless, I think you are entitled to have, and that it is my duty to frankly give, my individual opinion on the subject. It will no doubt be received for what it may be intrinsically worth. I can ask or expect nothing more.

"In regard to the operations of our Western armies, I fully concur in your views; but I think the condition of affairs in East Tennessee, and west of the Mississippi River, will require some modification in your plans, or at least will very much delay the operations of your proposed spring campaign. These however, are delays and changes which neither of us could anticipate."

"Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"H. W. HALLECK, *General-in-Chief.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AIR-TELEGRAPH

System of Telegraphing to Trains and Ships.

I have been asked to write something about my new system of telegraphy by induction between moving railway trains and the usual fixed stations, which makes it possible to send messages through the air without attaching any wire to the cars or to the track.

The induction coil has long been known to electricians and studied by them, but its enormous practical value does not seem to have been understood. Indeed, this has hardly been suspected by those who have used the coil simply in scientific experiments. A number of years ago an induction coil was made, which had the power of throwing sparks a distance of twenty-one inches and making them penetrate solid blocks of glass three inches thick; and this was considered so remarkable that it is recorded as among the most striking of experimental achievements. But I arrived at something much more startling than that, in the course of some researches which I had undertaken for another purpose. For some years I have been at work looking for a new force, traces of which I have often observed in my study of electrical and other action—a force which is constantly present in many forms and places, but has never been measured, named or brought under control. I have devised dozens of machines to test this unknown force and ascertain its characteristics; and I have now planned a test which may, within a few months, give me a clear proof of its existence and put me on the trail by which I can follow it up and capture it.

While I was carrying on investigations upon this line, I found that, by means of an apparatus which I had made, I could throw a very strong electric current *fifty feet* through the air, from one conductor to another, by means of a simple primary coil which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave no spark in the air, while the secondary coil connected therewith, although giving sparks through the air several inches in length, was powerless to transmit a wave over this great distance. This fact at once opened a whole new field for the practical use of induced electricity in telegraphing between points at which a wire connection would not be practicable. It was like finding suddenly a new volume of romance in the endless library of electrical wonders. Afterwards my friends, Mr. William Wiley Smith and Mr. E. T. Gilliland, came forward with an invention patented by them in 1881, for working the telephone by means of induced currents to and fro between railroad cars and a special wire near the track. We combined our resources, and I went on experimenting—having discarded the telephone and adopted Morse characters—until, beginning with a leap of the current through fifty feet of air, I am now able to send it five hundred and eighty feet. Hence it appeared that no special wire would be needed close to the track, because the current generated on the car could jump over to the regular Morse wires; and these wires were used by me, through the employment of proper instruments, to convey messages to their destination, without interfering with the regular traffic. The result of work by Mr. Gilliland and myself, in inventing, perfecting and adapting apparatus, is that a circuit can now be established between any train, either moving or at a stand-still on a railroad, and the terminus of the road; or between the trains and any station on the route. A circuit is also established between any one train and all other trains on the same road.

It would be out of place, here, to give all the details of the apparatus by which this is accomplished. The current generated on the car proceeds from a small five-cell battery placed under a table (or cabinet, as we call it), about two feet square, which holds the instrument. The table affords room for a Morse key, an electro-magnet and an instrument called a "vibrator," which, by means of a metal reed, gives a musical character to the electrical impulses caused by opening and closing the circuit. At the termini, or at any fixed station, all that is needed is a similar apparatus, with a twelve-cell battery and a wire connection with three or four of the regular telegraph wires. On the car the wires from the battery and instrument are grounded through the axles and wheels. Another wire leads up to the ordinary metal roof of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

car and charges it with electricity. The roofs of the several cars composing a train may also be connected by an insulated copper wire. In this way the roof acts as one side of a condenser, and the usual telegraph wires stretched on poles along the edge of the road-bed form the other side of the condenser. The current from the car battery and the roof of the car is of such a nature that the wave of electricity sent from the apparatus in the car lasts only about one 500,000th of a second. During this short period the air seems to conduct electricity; but if the current were allowed to remain any longer the air would enter into such a state as to oppose any further transmission. If now an interval of time is allowed to elapse the air regains its normal condition and another wave can be transmitted. In sending a single Morse letter, for instance the letter E, which is a single dot, over fifty separate waves with waits between them have to be transmitted, at the rate of six hundred per second. Those separate, rapid waves form a musical sound. A long or short depression of the key of an organ imitates the sound of the dots and dashes as heard in the receiving instrument. The operators, both on the car and at the fixed stations, hear these notes through telephonic sounders, so that the rattle of the train and the crackling noise of other messages rushing along the wires do not disturb them in the least. All that they hear from these receivers is a clear, crisp, humming note which is perfectly distinct in its short or long iterations. The operator on the car has the telephonic receivers fastened over his ears by a rubber strap, so that both hands remain free, one to work the key with and the other to write out messages as they arrive. The regular Morse waves traverse the wires at the rate of about thirteen to a second. Mine go through the air and along the wires at the rate, as I have said, of six hundred a second. This does not make it possible to send a message any more rapidly than on the regular Morse circuits; but it effects one result of the highest importance—that is, that one current does not interfere with the other. The sounds which we transmit by inductive electricity cannot be heard by operators at ordinary Morse instruments; but any average operator at a fixed station provided with our instrument can read our messages with even greater ease than he could read from the customary relay instrument.

Hence it makes no difference how many wires there may be along-side the railroad. No confusion is possible. Neither can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

car operators take messages off those wires when sent by means of ordinary currents. But messages sent by our apparatus from one train to another, or from trains to stations, can travel over the usual circuits without difficulty. Dispatches can be sent to or from the cars in either direction, either forward or backward along the route. The current leaps over to and runs along the wires, and whatever train or station may be called, that train or station will hear the call and answer it, but others which are not called will, of course, make no reply. Two trains passing each other on the road will not materially interrupt communication, because they pass within a few seconds, and the telegraphing to and from each one can be resumed immediately.

The expense of putting instruments in on cars or at stations will be small. No special wire will ever be needed except in extreme cases where regular wires diverge widely from the road-bed. The instruments on trains will occupy only a corner in either a baggage or a passenger car, and they can be moved from one car to another and set going again within a few minutes after the transfer. The advantage of this system over any which involves running a costly insulated wire between the rails or close to them is apparent in the fact that, while a single special wire could easily be cut by mischievous persons, nothing could break communication by our system, unless all the regular telegraph wires should be torn down. Furthermore, a wire running along the track would be apt to be injured by any accident to a train at the very moment when it would be essential to talk to that train. Under my system every train would be sending reports to the fixed stations all the time; so that even if the car in which the instrument was placed were to be overturned, it would not matter. The operators and train dispatchers would at once suspect an accident and telegraph accordingly to other trains.

This invention might well be called "the air-telegraph," because we are able by it to converse through the atmosphere from the wires. But the company to which it now belongs calls it simply the "railway telegraph." I expect to apply it in such a way that ships at sea, many miles apart, can exchange messages of any length by signals. This will, probably, be accomplished by using a balloon-kite coated with tin-foil, soaring several hundred feet above the deck and controlled by a fine wire. The song of the Sirens would have no charm for any mariner who could hear from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

home and send word to his sweetheart by this method. News of wrecks, distress, mutinies, etc., could be rapidly forwarded from ship to ship within each other's signalling area, and merchants could not only find out just where the ships are that carry valuable cargoes invoiced to them, but could also, if they desired, telegraph to alter the destination of their vessels, in accordance with changes of the market. In time of war a line of ships stationed along the coast or between the scene of active hostilities and the nearest telegraph office, could be of immense service in conveying by the "air-telegraph" news of the enemy's approach, or in transmitting dispatches where communication by the land routes was interrupted. In archipelagos and where small islands lie near the coast, this device would make it possible to telegraph from island to island or to the main shore much more cheaply than by laying submarine cables. Why should we not also use the same means for telegraphing from stations at long intervals, which might be set up in mountain or forest regions, which the wires do not commonly penetrate?

But it is not necessary to dwell on these and other uses to which the invention may be put in the future. There is one application of it which at present transcends all others and has been tried fully on the Staten Island Railroad. Before these pages are published it will also be in operation on the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad, where its value in train-dispatching will be illustrated. I am not familiar with the management of railroads, but some of those who are so assure me that the "air-telegraph" or railway telegraph will greatly facilitate railway service in the following ways:

1. On roads having a large traffic, it is more economical to dispatch freight trains (except in some cases of line and special freights) as soon as they are made up, and to allow them to make their run without being bound by a fixed schedule. A special and important instance of this is the way in which trains loaded with grain have to be sent from the West to the East as rapidly as possible. Any method that enables the train department to move such trains safely without a fixed schedule must be invaluable. On a single-track road, especially, with telegraph stations some distance apart, it is essential that the train department should watch and control the movements of trains so as to keep them clear from all dangers and collisions. As things are now, the chief train dispatcher is like a general trying to conduct a campaign and to move

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his various corps and divisions when communication with them for a large part of the time is cut off. The new system will give him absolute command of the whole field.

2. Besides moving trains under favorable conditions, the dispatcher has to contend with many serious difficulties in case of untoward events. Among these difficulties are "wrecks," damage to the roads, snow blockades, foggy weather, "broken trains," etc. All such obstructions cause grave disturbance, and necessitate the issuing of immediate orders. Under the existing system a long delay occurs before a report of the obstruction is received; even then the train dispatcher has only a faint idea of all the circumstances; and he cannot send his orders swiftly or to the best advantage. The new method obviates all this trouble and uncertainty. The moment anything goes seriously wrong on the roads either the operator on the train which has met with the accident, or the operator on the train nearest to it, telegraphs to the dispatcher. The dispatcher at once calls through his instrument for a report from every train, and in a few minutes he obtains full knowledge of the state and position of each train on his division. Having once got these data, he solves his problem at the shortest notice.

3. It must also be borne in mind that a delay in sending perishable goods, or in making fast expresses keep time, frequently causes a railroad a loss of many thousands of dollars for a single stoppage. The new system will prevent this loss. Prompt telegraphing to and fro will make it possible to run trains of superior class, or trains containing perishable goods, around other trains which cause the delay.

4. Dispatchers, by this system, can call up any and all trains, whether in motion or on a siding. And if a train, in accordance with schedule, has taken a siding, to wait until another train passes it, the dispatcher can order it to go ahead without regard to the other train, which meanwhile has been held back by his orders sent directly to it.

The usefulness of the invention is not confined to train-dispatching, however. It is evident that it can be employed to great advantage for ordinary telegraphic correspondence, whenever it is important that a message should be sent to some one on a train, whose destination is two or three days' travel distant from his starting-point. Sudden changes in the aspect of business affairs,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which require that a traveling agent or partner should be notified before he reaches his station, may be explained to him by the railway telegraph, while he sits in the car journeying along at the rate of thirty or forty miles an hour. Similarly he may send back to his office in New York, San Francisco or Chicago any information which he happens to pick up, or business decisions which he was not able to make before starting.

The benefit to newspaper correspondents is obvious. They can collect news at one town, and on their way to another place they can write their dispatches in the train and send them from it directly to the editorial office, wherever that office may be, thereby saving a great deal of time.

Police business will of course be greatly expedited by this system. The police authorities of any town or city, if they have reason to suppose that a criminal or a civil offender—such as embezzlers and confidence men—has taken to flight by railroad, can at once send descriptions and inquiries to all trains on the routes leading from their locality.

The working of the invention is not a matter of uncertainty. It is already developed and perfected, and can be applied anywhere. I have had it elaborately tested for several months, and it operates equally well in all weathers. So completely is it under control that, I think, by fastening metallic plates on houses near the regular lines of telegraph wires, offices could be opened in those houses, and an opposition telegraph system be started on the same wires. It is possible that I may in time find means of using telephones on trains, for oral conversation, which was the original idea of Mr. William Wiley Smith; but that would be a separate development. The new railway telegraph is complete, as it stands to-day; and, in its new utilization of induced electricity, as well as in its wide-spread, practical bearings, it seems to me—if I may speak of it for a moment without regard to my personal relation to it—one of the most important among recent inventions, in the results it is likely to accomplish.

THOMAS A. EDISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN OPEN LETTER.

No. 30 East Sixty-Third Street,
New York City, *January* 29, 1886.

To the Editor of the North American Review:

Sir: In an article called "An Acquaintance with Grant," published in your December number, I quoted General Sherman as having said since Grant's death that "had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson." I cited this speculative opinion from the highest officer in the army, thinking it would illustrate and lend interest to the general proposition I asserted concerning the effect of chance upon the soldier's career. I do not see that the speculation is injurious to General Grant, General Sherman, or anybody else. General Sherman, however, made my citation of it the subject of a correspondence with you, in consequence of which you discussed my statement in your January number, and announced that General Sherman had called on you to repudiate the sentiment attributed to him. This was followed by a letter from General Sherman to the Rev. George Morrison, dated January 12, published in the daily papers of the 16th, in which the general says: "It is utterly impossible that I could have written or spoken the words as quoted in the December number of the North American Review," and "that I could have written the positive expression, 'that, had C. F. Smith lived, General Grant would have disappeared from history,' is an impossibility;" adding, "I am confident in good time we shall learn on what authority or hearsay this publication is based." The issue between General Sherman and me is whether or not I quoted him correctly. In your February number, for an early copy of which I thank you, General Sherman says, coupled with much personal abuse of me, that I "invented the quotation for the purpose of questioning it," and that I, "when cornered will dodge the issue."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In view of the foregoing facts I need make no apology to the public for feeling called upon to establish the validity of the quotation I made. General Sherman himself is my authority. The remark that "had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson," was written with the general's hand over his signature, word for word as I gave it. That there may be no ground for misunderstanding concerning the language used and the connection in which it was employed I append a verbatim paragraph from a letter in General Sherman's handwriting dated September 6, 1885.

As intimated in General Sherman's letter to Mr. Morrison there is a marked difference between speculating "what might have been had General Grant gone to the rear and C. F. Smith fought the battle of Shiloh; what might have been had Washington accepted his warrant in the English navy," and "the positive expression that 'had C. F. Smith lived, General Grant would have disappeared from history.'" It is not my province to explain the relation between the two. Either, however, would serve the purpose with which I quoted General Sherman, namely, to illustrate the general proposition that "chance is an important factor in the race of glory," by citing the implied opinion of General Grant's especial friend that it was true at a particular stage of Grant's career.

Perhaps I ought to add that the letter from which I quoted was shown to me on account of its supposed historical value, and with no reference to the expression I quoted. Observing the fitness of that expression to the subject on which I was engaged, and having the consent of the person to whom the letter was addressed to make the citation, I did not hesitate to do so. The correspondence of which the letter is a part was between two officials—Colonel R. N. Scott and General Sherman—upon a popular subject, that implied no secrecy whatever; and the repudiation of my quotation was no doubt a surprise to Colonel Scott, as it was to me.

Please publish this note in the next number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and on account of the character and authority of the denial, use the fac-simile plate herewith for printing the extract from General Sherman's letter.

Yours truly,

JAMES B. FRY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXTRACT.

Now as to Halleck-Grant, I had the highest possible opinion of Halleck's knowledge and power, and never blamed him for mistrusting Grant's ability. Had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson. Smith was a strong, nervous, vigorous man when I reported to him in person at Fort Henry. . . . With great respect your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

As will be seen, on reading General Sherman's address in this issue, it is now unnecessary for me to comply with General Fry's request to republish in fac-simile the extract quoted. For General Sherman not only does not dispute its authenticity but has furnished for publication the entire letter to Colonel Scott, insisting, as he had done throughout, that the extract should not go on record in the REVIEW detached from the context.

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN UNSPOKEN ADDRESS TO THE LOYAL LEGION.

The following paper was prepared to be read at the meeting of the Loyal Legion at Cincinnati, Feb. 10 inst., a meeting of soldiers, to pass upon the points at issue, but the sudden and totally unexpected death of General W. S. Hancock the evening previous changed the whole character of the proceedings, and I now agree to its publication unabridged in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

W. T. SHERMAN, *General.*

NEW YORK, *Feb.* 12, 1886.

To my Comrades and Friends:

WHILST I seek retirement and peace, the newspapers take great liberties with me as with everybody else. They have published that my family will soon leave St. Louis because we are discontented, each paper assigning its own separate reason. There is no secret about it; all my family connections, and all who have a right to be consulted, understand the case perfectly. Ever since the failure of the Harrison Wire Company, at St. Louis, which involved my son-in-law, Captain Fitch, and which has resulted in the removal of his family to Pittsburg, we have been disturbed. Three of my children and seven grandchildren are now away from home, and there remain to us only three. Of these the youngest son, nineteen years old, on whom the family must soon depend, will graduate at St. Louis University, in June, 1886, wants to go to Yale College, and I want him to receive the best possible education. His going to New Haven in September will probably result in the few of us left going to New York, to be near him. I shall, however, retain all the property I possess in St. Louis (not much, to be sure), but all that I have to leave the family when I am laid in Bellefontaine Cemetery. I am perfectly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

content with my neighbors and friends of St. Louis, to whom I am very much attached, and who have done all they possibly can to make our stay with them agreeable.

The Fry matter is equally simple when viewed aright. Last summer after General Grant's funeral, which I attended, while traveling between New York, St. Louis, Minnetonka and Chicago, I was collecting materials for the tribute of respect I as President was requested to make to the memory of General Grant, our First Commander, before the Society of the Army of the Tennessee at our meeting at Chicago of September 9–10. That address was universally noted, copied in all the journals of the day, and was the *result* of that correspondence. The special quotation of General Fry in the December, 1885, number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW was not made from that public address, but from one of two *private* letters of inquiry addressed to Colonel Robert N. Scott, who had been on General Halleck's staff, and is now in charge of the War Records at Washington, of whom all army officers make frequent inquiries for scraps of information. Colonel Scott is a personal friend whom I have known since boyhood, and his father before him, in San Francisco, and I wrote to him with the same confidence I would to my own brother about family matters. I keep no copies of such letters, and write mine hastily, *carelessly*, and it was only January 29, 1886, two months after, that I obtained from Colonel Scott a copy of the correspondence, from which Fry had made his detached quotation. This correspondence presents the whole story better than I can state it anew. As soon as General Fry's article appeared, General Grant's friends called my attention to it, and my letter-book or memory retaining no expression of opinion so positive as that used, I naturally requested the Editor to ascertain from General Fry the source of his quotation, that I might explain or ascertain who had revealed my private letters. General Fry's answer was evasive, calling on General Sherman to deny the words, and the "sentiment" before he would substantiate his statement. I again called on him, and appealed to the War Department, all without success, generally explaining to correspondents that I thought it impossible I could have used that particular form of expression, and believed General Fry had a malicious motive. I received, too late, a notice by a roundabout way from a gentleman of Cincinnati that Fry was cunningly laying a trap to catch me, and it was not until January 29, 1886, that Colonel

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Scott himself first revealed to me the actual source of this mischievous paragraph. Detached and used as a text for a sermon it was as clear a *forgery* as was ever perpetrated. Taking my letter to Colonel Scott in its integrity, though manifestly never meant for publication, I contend it is eminently consistent with my constant friendship for General Grant from Shiloh to the day we deposited his remains in the tomb at Riverside. The date, September 6, 1885, is prior to the publication of Grant's "Memoirs" in which on page 385 he positively records that his position at Corinth, June, 1862, had become "so unbearable" that he had resolved to go to the rear, and was dissuaded by General Sherman—or, quoting his own words: "I then obtained permission to leave the department, but General Sherman happened to call on me as I was about starting and urged me so strongly not to think of going that I concluded to remain.

General Sherman in his "Memoirs," 1875, states the same fact with the further addition that he learned of General Grant's purpose to go back to St. Louis from General Halleck himself, and rode to General Grant's camp for the very purpose of dissuading him from committing this fatal mistake.

Now, it is a matter of notoriety that from February to July, 1862, General Grant was under a cloud, hounded by the newspapers, and by a clique of officers of whom Fry was one, until, as he himself says, his position became "unbearable." And, during all that time, General Sherman was his steadfast friend, and discovered in him those pure, unselfish, manly qualities which afterward yielded such precious fruits to our country and mankind. Can it then be wondered at, after twenty-four years, that General Sherman should be a little surprised that the habitual libeller of General Grant (see his published volume 1884, "The Army under Buell"), should attempt to assume the character of Grant's panegyrist at his expense?

There is not a member of the Supreme Court, of Congress, or any lawyer who will consent to the publication of his manuscript without the privilege of revising the "proof;" and, moreover, Provost-Marshal General Fry knows that in the trial by court-martial of the humblest private soldier the testimony of each witness is subject to "revision" before becoming a part of the Record. Yet he obtains from a confiding friend, a private letter, publishes it to the world, *garbled*, and makes it a text for a sermon to General

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Sherman, and when politely asked for the source of his quotation he answers coolly, "Better let the case rest where it is." If he thinks he has achieved a cheap newspaper victory over General Sherman he is welcome. The man who got off with my overcoat may keep it, for I have bought a new one.

Now, my friends, I want to direct your attention to all there is in this case—"much ado about nothing." At the date of that letter, September 6th, there was to be a meeting of the Society of the Army of the Tennessee, at Chicago, September 9–10, 1885. General Sherman was at Lake Minnetonka, and being summoned by the family of General Grant at his death, July 23, 1885, went to Mount McGregor, and remained till his body was finally entombed, August 8, 1885. Compelled to travel from New York to St. Louis, to Lake Minnetonka, to Chicago, and St. Louis—back again to Chicago for the army meeting, he was forced to collect materials for his address "on the wing." That "Address" was the result of this correspondence, and it has been universally copied, and was in the hands of General Fry when he composed his paper for the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, of December, 1885. Utterly ignoring this public address, which was the conclusion I had reached from the correspondence and from personal knowledge, General Fry *segregates* a single paragraph from one of many private letters of inquiry of which he became possessed wrongfully, and now wants to prove to the world that General Sherman lied, actually resorting to police methods of reproducing photograph copies of a paragraph in a letter which he could well understand General Sherman had forgotten, and which in the aggregate was most eulogistic of General Grant.

Any lawyer or logician reading the whole of this correspondence —not the garbled extracts—will see that on the 6th of September, 1885, my mind was working out the antithesis to be used at Chicago only three days later, before my comrades and friends, all of them ardent friends of General Grant, to contrast the Grant of Donelson, February, 1862, and the Grant of Appomattox and dead hero of 1885, an interval of twenty-three long eventful years.

As to General Halleck, I had in him the most unbounded confidence in 1862. He was the best-informed scholar of the military art in America, McClellan not excepted. I knew him familiarly at West Point for three years; sailed with him around Cape Horn in 1846 on board the "Lexington;" was associated with him in Cali-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fornia for the four years of the Mexican War, and knew him for another six years when he was a member of the eminent law firm of Halleck, Peachy, Billings & Park. But war is a terrible test. Halleck did not stand this test, whereas General Grant did. Halleck was a theoretical soldier. Grant was a practical soldier.

In February, 1862, General Halleck's fame and power were transcendant and that of Grant hardly recognized, whereas, in 1864, Halleck had dwindled into a mere Chief of Staff, and General Grant had earned such renown that he was enabled to dictate his own terms to the President and Secretary of War.

We are now told that the road to fame and public favor in America is strewn with the carcasses of men who "wrote letters." This is true—and it is equally true that you cannot pick up a handful of soil which does not contain some part of what was once a human being, full of the life and hope, and fear, which we all feel; the very bread on our tables contains the phosphate which once was part of the embodiment of an immortal soul. Nevertheless, must we in our short sojourn on earth deny ourselves the happiness and pleasure of social intercourse and correspondence? Why is the Post Office the most popular of our Government establishments? Must we abstain from all communication with family and friends because some one may imprudently or maliciously reveal our secret thoughts? Even among the twelve Disciples one proved false, whilst the eleven remained true, and spread the Gospel of Peace to all the world. Does the enlightened Press of America aim that no honorable man can serve the Government? Is this to be the result of our Free Government? These are questions which we can leave to our successors in the "next war."

I remember only too well that in the last war, in the midst of gloom and tribulation, I derived from the Public Press but little encouragement—but from such men as S. S. L. L'Hommedieu, Charles Anderson, Silas F. Miller of Cincinnati, James E. Yeatman, the Reverend W. G. Eliot and Henry Turner of St. Louis, my heart was warmed, and my arm strengthened in the good cause for which we fought. Therefore am I willing to be adjudged imprudent by confiding in personal friends rather than to the public press, which must more or less trim its sails to the surface breezes.

Now, I give the whole correspondence, without abridgement, and I invite special attention to the letter of September 6, 1885, from which General Fry made his extract:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[COPY.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 26, 1886.

GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN, *U. S. Army, St. Louis, Mo.:*

DEAR GENERAL: You and I have made a "mess of it"—you by writing a letter to me of great historic interest and forgetting it, and I by using the letter for the information of some of my friends.

On the 30th of August last you wrote to me for certain information, to be used in a speech, about Allen, Halleck, and Grant; I replied September 4th calling your attention to Record evidence on the subject and commenting upon it. On September 6th you rejoined, writing among other things as follows:

"Now as to Halleck and Grant. I had the highest possible opinion of Halleck's knowledge and power, and never blamed him for mistrusting Grant's ability. Had C. F. Smith lived Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson. Smith was a strong, nervous, vigorous man when I reported to him in person at Fort Henry."

I sent both your letters to my friend, General Fry, who is deeply interested in the history of Grant and Halleck, is very friendly to both, and who had, as I knew, investigated the very question you have asked. Fry was struck by your Grant-Smith conjecture, and desired it to illustrate one of the points in his "Acquaintance with Grant." As that conjecture was neither esoteric nor hurtful, I without hesitation assented to such use of it, little dreaming it was a package of unlabeled dynamite.

Since the publication of your Morrison letter, Fry feels it incumbent upon him to prove that he has not misquoted you; I recognize that necessity, but desire that his vindication be accomplished at a minimum of annoyance to you.

I enclose copies of your letters of August 30, September 6, 1885, of my letter of September 4, 1885, and of Fry's letter to me of 24th instant.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT N. SCOTT.

[COPY.]

CHICAGO, Ill., *September* [*August*], 30, 1885.

DEAR SCOTT: I am here *en route* for Mansfield, Ohio, where we have a family reunion. Thence I go to St. Louis, preparatory to coming again to Chicago for the annual meeting of the Society of the Army of the Tennessee, September 9–10,

At that meeting I will be compelled to speak somewhat of General Grant, but will try to limit myself to his connection with the Army of the Tennessee, of which he was the first commander. I am somewhat familiar with the early events of 1862, but there is one point of which you must have personal knowledge. When General Halleck reached Corinth he was compelled, by superior orders from Washington, to send the Army of the Cumberland, General Buell,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

back toward Chattanooga, and the remaining forces were distributed defensively along the Charleston and Memphis Railroad from Corinth to Memphis, Grant being assigned to the "District of Memphis." Then when Halleck was himself ordered to Washington he cast about for his own successor, and fixed on General Robert Allen, Chief Quartermaster at St. Louis, and offered him the command. I knew of this fact at the time from Halleck himself, also from Allen, and that Allen declined.

Have you any personal knowledge on this point? or in Halleck's letter-books or telegrams, do you find the specific orders or inquiries? Allen is still living in London, but is too far away for me to ask him. Can you fortify my memory in this particular? I will be at 912 Garrison Avenue, St. Louis, from Saturday September 5th to Tuesday September 8th, and will be personally obliged if you will answer.

With great respect, as always your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

[COPY.]

WASHINGTON, *September* 4, 1885.

GENERAL SHERMAN, U. S. A., ST. LOUIS, MO.

MY DEAR GENERAL: Your letter of 30th ultimo has been received. By slip you dated it *September* 30.

Grant's geographical command from February 17 to October 16, 1862, was the "District of West Tennessee," but as early as April 21st of that year he began in orders, etc., to style his mobilized force the "Army of the Tennessee." See "Official Rebellion Records," Vol. X, Part 2d, pages 116, 144, 154, and specially note, Part 4th of the order on page 144. Also see Halleck to Grant, May 12th, on page 182, *ibid.*

On June 10, 1862, Grant, Buell, and Pope were ordered to resume command of their respective "Separate Army Corps," viz., the armies of the Tennessee, the Ohio, and the Mississippi. See "R. R.' Vol. X, Part 2d, page 288.

Memphis was formally embraced in Grant's command, June 12, 1862. He entered the city on the 23d of that month; but you were the first commander of the "District" of that name.

On July 11, 1862, Halleck was ordered to Washington. Immediately upon receipt of the President's order he telegraphed Grant to come to him at Corinth. See documents herewith, which are printed in Volume XVI (not yet indexed) of the "Rebellion Records."

Halleck left the West hoping to return. No successor to his command in the "Department of the Mississippi" was ever appointed. It simply fell apart when he left Corinth. Grant and Buell dividing so much of it as was East of the Mississippi.

Halleck was certainly very fond of Allen, and had a high opinion of his administrative ability, but from facts within my personal knowledge I have for twenty years at heart believed that Halleck never *seriously* thought of Allen as his own successor in the Department of the Mississippi. I know the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

story as Badeau gives it, but I do not believe it. The only official light on the subject appears in the documents I send you.

It is a pleasure to me to give you all information in my power on any war topic of interest to you.

By the end of this year everything relating to the war to the end of 1863, will be in type or ready for the printers. The Chickamauga and Mine Run campaigns are now being arranged for him. I mention this because I am informed that the preface to new edition of your "Memoirs" finds fault with the progress I have made.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT N. SCOTT.

[COPY.]

(ENCLOSURE FROM SCOTT.)

912 GARRISON AVE., ST. LOUIS, MO., *Sept.* 6, 1886.

COL. R. N. SCOTT, WAR RECORDS, WASHINGTON D. C.

DEAR SCOTT: I thank you as always for your answer of September 4, and for the extracts which accompanied the letter. I don't believe you have a better friend than the undersigned in the world outside your family, and I loved and revered your father in California when you were a mischievous boy. But I do say the Government of the United States, President and Congress, have been guilty of the most cruel act of injustice of which history in the future will deal. This Government called to its military service in 1861–5 two millions of its best men, and shoved them by detachments against an organized rebellion. Newspaper correspondents, sutlers, stragglers, and refugees, wrote the contemporaneous history, whilst every man who went to fight, had a right to expect that the Government would protect his fair fame, as dear to him as life; and yet we are here in 1885, twenty years, and the Government history is still groping in the dull obscure facts of 1862. See Series 1, Vol. XII, Part 3d.

Now if one year of war takes twenty years to record, how much will four years take? Eighty years. I contend, and have contended with European officers of world-wide fame, that the military profession of America was not responsible for the loose preliminary operations of 1862, and that it was not till after both Gettysburg and Vicksburg that the war professionally began. Then our men had learned in the dearest school of earth the simple lesson of war. Then we had brigades, divisions and corps which could be handled professionally, and it was then that we as professional soldiers could rightfully be held to a just responsibility.

This is the point I shall endeavor to make in my Memoirs, but never reflecting on you personally or officially. I hold the Republican party responsible. Instead of appropriating $5,000–$25,000, etc., for the War Records, the annual appropriation should have been a million in 1866, two million in 1867 and after, so that by 1870 the work should have been done. The Germans were less than six years in their Official Records.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now as to Halleck-Grant. I had the highest possible opinion of Halleck's knowledge and power, and never blamed him for mistrusting Grant's ability. Had C. F. Smith lived, Grant would have disappeared to history after Donelson. Smith was a strong, nervous, vigorous man when I reported to him in person at Fort Henry. I saw him again and again at Savannah, on his steamboat the "Tigress," I believe. He threatened to arrest me if I did not prevent Colonel Tom Worthington coming to bore him. I saw him after he skinned his leg in stepping into a yawl-boat, and I believe as well as I believe that three years ago I lived in Washington, that General Smith reported to General Halleck, that by reason of this mere accident he could not mount a horse, and that was the real reason that General Grant, then left behind at Fort Henry, was ordered forward to Savannah, and Pittsburg Landing to resume his command. General Smith's Adjutant-General, T. J. Newsham, is still living over in Edwardsville, Illinois, and he insists that after the General's death he carefully prepared a full copy of letters and telegrams which were sent to Mrs. C. F. Smith. These will turn up.

The same or similar of the facts reported by Badeau on page 108, vol. I and I believe he possesses the letter of General Robert Allen, from which he quotes at length. I am certain that Halleck told me as much, and that Allen did also. Halleck and Grant are now dead, but Allen lives in London, has prepared much for publication, but his last letter to me within the year intimates he will *not* publish, but his MSS. will remain and the truth will come out. I believe the fact as firmly as I believe that Mr. Lincoln made his executive order of July 11, 1862, assigning General Halleck to "the command of all the land forces of the U. S. as general in chief."

I believe Mr. Lincoln was justified in this act by the then condition of affairs, and that he, Halleck, having no one willing and competent in his judgment to command the three armies of Buell, Pope, and Grant, made the best disposition he could of affairs at the West, and most properly obeyed the positive order of President Lincoln to go East.

Grant therefore was called back to Corinth by virtue of his commission, not by selection, and simply resumed command of all the troops left in the District of West Tennessee.

On the 23rd of June, 1862, I myself saw General Grant en route from Corinth to Memphis, 96 miles; had a long talk with him. He was *ordered* there and made the ride by land without escort other than his orderlies and clerks. He was *ordered* back to Corinth, July 11, by way of Columbus because Halleck was ordered to Washington, the motive for which was the condition of affairs with McClellan in Virginia.

From the 21st of February, 1862, till July 11, 1862—five long, bitter months—Grant was under a cloud, but these tested and strengthened the qualities which were in him and which produced such fruits.

I don't blame Mr. Lincoln or Halleck, Buell or any body, but I do believe we now after twenty years should know more of the exact truth than we seem to possess.

With great respect, your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[COPY.]

912 GARRISON AVENUE, ST. LOUIS, MO., *Jan.* 12, 1886.

GEO. MORRISON, ESQ., No 287 N. CAROLINE ST., BALTIMORE, MD.

Dear Sir: I have received your letter of the 7th with newspaper slip inclosed, also the postal card of the 8th. Of course I have read carefully the first volume of General Grant's "Memoirs," and regard it as admirable in every sense, and now await the second volume, which I doubt not will be equally valuable and interesting. From the day I reported to him from Paducah till his death our relations were as brothers rather than as commander and commanded, and it is utterly impossible that I could have written or spoken the words as quoted by General Fry in the December number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. I am convinced General Grant never authorized General Fry to speak for him, and I know that I never authorized him to speak for me. I have endeavored through the Editor of the REVIEW to have General Fry say where he obtained his quotation, thus far without success. I have a very large correspondence, and converse freely with thousands of people, and, as is natural, we often speculate what *might have been* had General Grant gone to the rear, and C. F. Smith fought the battle of Shiloh—what *might have been* had Washington accepted his warrant in the English Navy, etc., but that I could have written the positive statement that "had C. F. Smith lived General Grant *would* have disappeared from history" is an impossibility.

Personally I want to live in peace, to avoid all controversy, but am confident in good time we shall learn on what authority or hearsay General Fry based his publication. I enclose with this a slip containing my last public utterence about General Grant, when I announced his death to his old comrades of the Army of the Tennessee.

I don't believe any man, living or dead, has borne more willing testimony to General Grant's great qualities, especially as demonstrated at Henry, Donelson, Shiloh and Vicksburg than myself, and it is rather late in the day for General Fry to assume the office of panegyrist at my expense.

Yours truly,

W. T. SHERMAN.

[COPY.]

30 EAST 63D STREET, N. Y. CITY, *January* 24, 1886.

COL. R. N. SCOTT.

My dear Colonel: You have no doubt seen the letter from General Sherman to the Rev. George Morrison, which appeared recently in the daily papers, and is republished in the "Army and Navy Register" of the 23d inst., just received. The Morrison letter is clearly intended as a denial of the statement made by me in the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW concerning General Sherman. The "New York Times," heads the letter "*General Sherman refutes a slander,*" and the public generally, so far as I can learn, consider that General Sherman has denied the statement made by me. After weighing the matter and consulting my friends, I am forced to the conclusion that I must make public proof that I quoted General Sherman correctly.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES B. FRY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[COPY.]

912 GARRISON AVENUE, ST. LOUIS, MO., *January* 29, 1886.

COL. R. N. SCOTT, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Dear Scott: Your letter of the 26th with inclosures is received, and this is the first glimpse I have caught of the source of Fry's quotation in his article "Acquaintance with Grant" in the December number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. My letter to you of September 6, 1885, was purely private, and one from which General Fry had no right to quote without my consent; but even after he had so quoted, if he had answered the editor's most courteous inquiry at my instance of December 5, I could in a paragraph have changed "would" to might, or have interlined "probably" to express more fully my meaning. You are at liberty to make either of these changes in that letter, and put on your official files.

What I take exception to, is, having Fry, who was never the confidant of General Grant or General Sherman, posing as the panegyrist of the former at the expense of the latter.

When in 1862–3 General Grant needed a friend, I was that friend, and it seems odd that now when General Grant needs no friend, General Fry should step in to claim the privilege.

Fry may do what he pleases, I will do the same.

Sincerely your friend,

W. T. SHERMAN.

THE following address by General W. T. Sherman (delivered as President of the Society), before the Society of the Army of the Tennessee, at Chicago, September 9, 1885, is published for the convenient reference of the reader. W. T. S.

Though in war death makes the battle-field his harvest, yet in peace he insidiously invades the most sacred premises, taking here the innocent babe, there the gentle, loving wife, again the youth in lusty manhood and the King on his throne. During our last vacation he has stricken from our list of members the very head and front—General U. S. Grant, the same who, in the cold winter of 1861–62, gathered together at Cairo, Ill., the fragments of an army and led them up the Tennessee River. The creator and father of the Army of the Tennessee took his final leave of earth at 8:8 on the morning of July 23, 1885, from Mount McGregor, a spur of the Alleghanies, in plain view of the historic battle-field of Saratoga. He had finished his life's work and had bequeathed to the world his example. The lightning's flash carried the sad tidings to all parts of the civilized earth, and I doubt whether, since the beginning, there ever arose so spontaneous a wail of grief to bear testimony before High Heaven that mankind had lost a kindred spirit and his countrymen a leader. We, his first war comrades, concede to the family their superior rights, but claim the next place in the grand procession of mourners.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We were with him in his days of adversity as well as prosperity, and were as true to him as the needle to the pole. We shared with him the trials and tribulations, as well as the labors and battles of Henry, Donelson, Shiloh, Corinth, Iuka, and Vicksburg, when that transcendent and most valuable of all victories turned the universal gaze of our bewildered countrymen to the new star in the West, which plainly foretold the man who had dispelled the cloud which "lowered o'er our house," and was to lead us to the triumphant victories of 1865 and to the stable, enduring prosperity of 1885.

In the year 1839 I was a first-class man in the United States Military Academy at West Point, a position of exaltation never reached since, though reasonably successful in life, and there appeared on the walls of the hall in "Old North Barrack" a list of new cadets, among which was "U. S. Grant." A crowd of lookers-on read "United States Grant," "Uncle Sam Grant," "Sam Grant," and Sam Grant he is to-day in the traditions of the old 4th U. S. Infantry. It afterward transpired that his name was actually Ulysses Hiram Grant, and the mistake had been made by General Hamer, the member of Congress who nominated him as the cadet from his district. Cadet Grant tried to correct this mistake at the beginning and end of his cadet life without success, and to history his name must ever be U. S. Grant. I remember his personal appearance at the time, but the gulf of separation between a first-class man and a "plebe" at West Point was and still is deeper and wider than between the General-in-Chief and a private soldier in the army, so that I hardly noticed him. His reputation in the 4th Infantry, in which he served through the Mexican war and until he resigned his commission of captain in Oregon, July 31, 1854, was of a good, willing officer, always ready for duty, extremely social and friendly with his fellows, but in no sense conspicuous, brilliant, or manifesting the wonderful qualities afterward developed in him.

I met him again when the civil war had broken out—when chaos seemed let loose and the gates of hell wide open in every direction. Then came the news of General Grant's attack on the enemy's camp at Belmont on November 7, 1861, soon followed by the events of Columbus, Paducah, Henry and Donelson—all so simple, so direct, so comprehensible, that their effect on my mind was magical. They raised the dark curtain which before had almost hidden out all hope for the future, and displayed the policy and course of action necessary only to be followed with persistence to achieve ultimate success. I found General Grant at Fort Henry, under orders from General Halleck to remain there and to turn over the command of his army, then flushed with victory under his immediate leadership, to General C. F. Smith, his next in rank. It so happened that General Smith had been Adjutant and Commandant when Grant and I were cadets at West Point, and he was universally esteemed as the model soldier of his day. He had also acquired large fame in the Utah expedition and in the then recent capture of Fort Donelson, so that General Grant actually looked up to him as the older if not the better soldier, though he was at that time the senior by commission. Not one word of complaint came from him, only a general expression of regret that he had been wrongly and unjustly represented to General Halleck, and he advised to give to Gen-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eral Smith my most loyal support. General Smith conducted the expedition up the Tennessee River to Savannah, Eastport and Pittsburg Landing, gave all the orders and instructions up to within a few days of the battle of Shiloh, when his health, shattered by the merest accident, compelled him to relinquish the command again to General Grant, who quietly resumed it where Smith had left off, "accepted the situation," made few or no changes, and fought on the ground which had been selected by General Smith the bloody battle of Shiloh. During this fiercely contested battle he displayed the coolness, the personal courage, forethought and deliberation which afterward made him famous among men; yet was he traduced, slandered and wronged, not only by the press universally, but by those who were in positions of authority over him.

Others have told the whole story of the war, and still others are repeating and elaborating. Even he himself, almost in his dying hours, was engaged in recording his experience, and we all await the publishing with profound interest. I have seen some of the manuscript and have been told the rest, but prefer to await the whole publication, certain that what he has recorded of his own knowledge will stand the test of time, and I am sure that he himself will have recognized the truth and will have recorded the fact that his campaigns from Belmont to Vicksburg were the most valuable of his whole life. In that brief period he discovered the power that was in him—that he, in fact, impersonated the great mass of our best people, who abhorred war and only resorted to it when national honor and safety demanded it.

He knew little and cared less about "Strategy," and I doubt if he ever read "Jomini," "Grotius," or any books on the art and laws of war, except the West Point text-books. So with "Tactics." He never—so far as I can recall—expressed a preference for Hardee over Scott, Casey or Morris. Still, he loved to see order and system, and wanted his corps, divisions, brigades and regiments handy and well instructed when called for. He aimed to achieve results, caring little for the manner by which they were accomplished. He possessed and always asserted the most perfect faith in the justice of our cause, and always claimed that sooner or later it must prevail, because the interest of all mankind demanded the existence of just such a Republic as we had inherited, and that as by the concurrence of political causes the conflict had fallen upon us we had only to meet it like brave men and conquer as a matter of course.

The newspapers of the day have been so full of all the details of the funeral that it were superfluous for me to say more than it was one of the most complete tributes of the living to the dead which this country has ever witnessed. Beginning at Mount McGregor on the morning of Tuesday, August 4, it continued without interruption till six o'clock P.M. of Saturday, August 8, 1885, to the spot selected by his son, approved by his entire family, and accepted by all who had a right to be consulted. This spot is "on the banks of the Hudson," at the upper end of Riverside Park—not a park in the sense of a pleasure ground, but a hill as yet in the rough and susceptible of infinite embellishment, which will remain as firm as the granite rocks on which it stands till the earth shall give up its dead and time shall be no more. If

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the spirits of the dead have the privilege of contemplating their own tomb, then will General Grant be content, for from the pedestal he can look upon the old Revolutionary forts—Lee and Washington—at his very feet, the beautiful Palisades just across the river, Tappan Zee and the Highlands above, the mighty city of New York, with its busy harbor below, and Long Island Sound across the peninsula. I am well aware that some of our comrades would have preferred Washington city as the burial-place of our dead General, but let us examine the facts and precedents.

President Washington is buried at Mount Vernon; Jefferson at Monticello; the Adamses, at Quincy; Jackson, at the Hermitage; Harrison, at North Bend; Polk, at Nashville; Taylor, at Louisville; Lincoln, at Springfield; Garfield, at Cleveland. And so also of the army: Scott is buried at West Point; Meade, at Philadelphia; Thomas, at Troy; McPherson at Clyde, whilst all of these, or nearly all, have statues or busts in the National Capital. So may it be with Grant. Each city, town and even hamlet may have whatever monument they are willing to erect, but it seems to me better that all should unite and build a strong, solid, simple monument, characteristic of the man, over his grave "on the banks of the Hudson," and then, like Shakespeare, inscribe on it:

"Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbeare,
To digg the dust encloased heare,
Blest be ye man yt spares thes stones
And curst be he yt moves my bones."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERN FRENCH FICTION.

A POPULAR delusion seems to confine modern French fiction into two wide-apart currents, Naturalism and Idealism; the former new, young and strong, the second old-fashioned, debilitated, nearly exhausted, whose struggling representatives try to fight out their last battle.

It is a delusion—popular, may be, but like most delusions, apt to fade away when submitted to serious cross-examination. Unluckily, there is nothing in the world so long-lived as error, and for many a day people will continue to think, say and print that France has no pure modern fiction, just as they say that there is no French home-life. Speak to them of Jules Sandeau and Octave Feuillet, they will sigh and say: Oh yes, then! they were good authors, indeed—but since!

The prevailing opinion seems to be that Idealism has given up the ghost, which ghost is faintly fluttering over some poor authors scant of brains: these may only be respected for their noble, though useless endeavors to hold up a tattered banner.

There is some plea for such general though misguided opinion. Actual Naturalism, being much more riotous and offensive than his gentlemanly cousin Idealism, fights his battle with drums and trumpets, never ceasing to write notorious articles, in which he abuses all those who are not his humble slaves, and praises absurdly obnoxious but naturalist writers, untalented as well as ignorant of real French language, and tries his best to pervade the world with the idea that only bad things are worthy of mention.

That was not the leading thought of Champfleury when he wrote his novels full of minute and careful observation of common life. He considered commonplace things as worthy of notice. Has not history proved many a time how deeply little things may affect the destiny of mankind? But he did not neglect nor discard the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

real events of love and life. His literary enemies threw at him, like a stone, the new-fangled epithet of Realist. He caught it and used it as a hammer.

Thence followed a bright period of fiction. George Sand was at the highest of her power, and her deep fancies moved her readers strongly, whilst, by the purity and richness of her style, she bent even the most reluctant to admiration. Jules Sandeau gave every year one or two delightful novels. Octave Feuillet wrote a series of strong and fine novels, whose only fault for French artistic taste is, perhaps, some too outwardly apparent moralizing tone. Victor Cherbuliez, born in Geneva, but from an old French family, published his interesting tales, somewhat more philosophical than needed, but very bright and full of quaint humor. Those three may be considered as having deserved well, by the dainty and unimpeachable perfection of their style, from French literature.

Meanwhile a quiet man lived at his country house at Croissy, on the banks of the river Seine. He toiled hard at his pen, rejecting every word which did not fully satisfy his fastidious taste, spending a day over a single phrase, and throwing on the misery of a poor misled woman (*Madame Bovary*) a veil of poetry and powerful language, such as to call on her the most artistic pity. Flaubert had no well-defined programme; his studies of life were realistic, but he had a feeling of beauty, a sense for the music and rhythm of phrases which his followers—except Alphonse Daudet and Guy de Maupassant—have seldom, if ever, experienced.

Flaubert's style is not cast in the common mold, and may seem affected—it is, at times; but there is real power in it—power which extends its grasp to the minutest as well as to the grandest features of character, scenery. Some pages in *Salammbô* will remain as a splendid specimen of French literature.

About the same time Edmond and Jules de Goncourt, brothers by birth, and more than brothers by their beautiful affection for each other, conceived an idea of fiction which they thought new. It was merely an exaggeration of Flaubert's principles.

They took a special case: the life of an artist among artists, or that of a misguided maid of all work, or the conversion to Catholicism of an indifferent woman, in the mystic atmosphere of Papal Rome; and showed there such complete oblivion of all that did

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not exactly belong to their subject, as to give the impression that every book had been written by a specialist, acquainted with that matter to the exclusion of everything else.

The peculiarity of their style is another imitation of Flaubert. But where he stands as a master, they often entangle themselves with a perfect maze of words and phrases. Their aim being the expression by words of things which belong not to the dominion of Thought, but to the external senses, they care little about precision. They care still less about syntax or construction; one could almost say that they enjoy most what is utterly anti-grammatical, and they triumphantly put on the paper such phrases as this: He went down the street, with on his back, a woman's curiosity; this meaning, that he went, and a woman was looking after him.

Strange to say, that oddity in their style, allows them sometimes to reach to a very high pitch of intense description; they are poets, and, with all their faults, some of their books are unrivaled; but they are untranslatable, and it is almost impossible to read them aloud, on account of the construction of their phrase.

Zola, who came next, is the man of theory, whose powerful talent at times soars very near to genius. Nobody can say what he would not have been but for the unfortunate error which led him astray from the beginning. He pretends that no fiction has a right to be, if not made out of real events, based upon what he calls "the human document." This theory would merely be the death of fiction; newspaper accounts of accidents or murders would make novelists quite useless. Is it not the very gift of fiction to invent, to create characters and events suiting each other, and to enrobe them with the magnificent garment of poetry and style?

Zola has proved the nonenity of his theory when he finds himself unable to bring it out into practice. He may heap "human documents," and even borrow from life real pages of history, use the newspapers as his richest mine of information—none of his characters are really living unless he forgets that they must be so very realistic, and is a writer again—an artist instead of a mere copyist.

It has been remarked that very few of the events whose faithful historiographer he pretends to be, could ever have happened to the characters whose description he has so elaborately given. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the pretended reality of his novels ceases. Works of fiction they are and nothing else—so much the better for him. When they grow into realistic minuteness they become very dry and uninteresting.

Another fancy of his is the use of vulgar words for describing vulgar people and things which belong to them. This might be forgiven up to a certain extent when those people are conversing; it has no reason whatever for existence when Zola becomes the describer. An author ought never to forget that by using debasing language he affords to the reader less a vivid picture than a painful exposure of self-debasement. Coarse words do not imply strength, neither can they imply beauty. One might almost say that they are rather a proof of weakness.

He never has been so powerful as when he did not voluntarily confine himself to the most repulsive sides of life; some of his first novels will outlive the more recent ones by many years. At those times he wrote also much better than he does now. Still he never had that natural gift of style possessed by many, less worthy of notice than his powerful though infatuated self.

According to common usage, Zola ought to have a numerous brood of imitators, and there is, indeed, a whole set of young people who write disgusting things, so-called novels, following not the talent of the master, but only his faults. Those do not belong to fiction, and French readers discard them; they can please only the vilest scum.

Still, a man of great talent has risen since a few years; by the choice of his subjects, Guy de Maupassant seems to belong to Zola's school, but he has a gift which they have not; a feeling both strong and dainty for poetry, and an excellent style of writing, pure, clear, almost classic. His observation of life does not pretend so much as Zola's, and is far more exact; his conversations are life itself. When Guy de Maupassant will choose to write a novel, deliberately dropping such objectionable tales as he now seems to prefer, he will be considered as one of the brightest living authors.

Naturalists do their best to claim Alphonse Daudet as one of themselves, but he knows better. Daudet never has been a naturalist, though there was a time when he was tempted by their broad tendencies; but the dainty feeling of romance which his Southern blood had worked into his mind, the deep love and charity

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which were throbbing through his soul, could not allow him to be allured by the dry, matter-of-fact programme of naturalism.

A. Daudet is a man, and never wished to be anything but a living, loving, suffering, exulting man, following his mood. This is the cause which makes his novels so full of intense life and feeling; by his allowing himself to be only a man—neither a teacher nor a prophet—he attains to greatness and still wins the hearts of all those who live, love, exult and suffer.

His first short novelettes were very delicate and refined, perhaps somewhat *maniéré*, but when still very young, he wrote *Fromont jeune et Risler ainé*, he proved that he had in himself the most tender shadows of dreamy poetry, as well as the power of stormy passion. From that day he was a master.

For some years, he seemed to have chosen his way among the sensational novelists, though by far the greatest; *le Nabab* and *Les Rois en Exil* belong to that period. Since then A. Daudet appears to favor shorter tales, into those he pours all the treasures which he somewhat lavishly squandered before. His two last novels, *l'Evangeliste* and *Sapho*, have also a new form of style, more stern and noble. He is fully master of his fancy, as well as of the drapery in which he wants it to be clad, and we may be sure that now, whatever A. Daudet chooses to give us, the book will be long looked for and long praised when born.

All the novels above mentioned are, more or less—rather more than less—objectionable, in the ordinary sense of that word. Excepting Daudet's *Contes du Lundi, Lettres de mon Moulin* and *Le petit Chose*, in its expurged edition, none of those books ought to be left in a room where are young ladies. Nor are the novels of Paul Bourget, from first to last, to be left there. Though a man of undeniable talent he writes books painful to read and unpleasant to remember. His psychology is very demoralizing and verges too near on physiology to be accepted as idealism. Pierre Loti does not seem to care for idealism, and still he has a great deal of it in himself. His novels are of the objectionable kind, but there is so much poetry in them, and he is so full of yearning toward all that is beautiful and true, that one must feel sympathy for the author through his books. Some lines blotted and *Mon frère Yves* would be faultless. As it is, that book is the best which ever was written about a sailor's life and feelings.

We are coming now to a very different class of literary works.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

People are quite ready to acknowledge the artistic superiority of our authors, provided it be settled, once and forever, that they are utterly wanting in morals.

Octave Feuillet and Cherbuliez are extremely moral, and are so much appreciated in their own country that no person having the slightest notion of culture could be excused for not having read their books. But many other and more recent works honor actual French fiction, and are justly prized. One of those most prominent novelists is Ferdinand Fabre, whose excellent style brings forward striking and splendid characters. He is expected to have very soon a seat in the French Academy.

His pictures are principally of a peculiar class of people—French priests and those who belong to them. *Les Courbezon* and *La petite Mère* are novels, but *Tigrane* and *Lucifer* hardly answer to this appellation, for there is no trace of love in these stern and wonderfully exact pictures of a priest's life-struggles and ambitions. Young ladies may find them tiresome, and if so, shall not be requested to read them, but any man who cares about his fellow sufferers ought to dive with F. Fabre into the deep recesses of those human souls who have voluntarily renounced the cares and joys of common life for an ideal of their own.

Emile Pouvillon has some analogy with F. Fabre, not in the choice of subjects, but by his quaint, original way of presenting the simple-hearted peasant of our hills, Les *Cévennes*. No great events, no romantic adventures, but he knows how to win your heart. *Césette* is one of the most delightful books ever written.

André Theuriet, who loves Lorraine and its mossy forests, is a fine writer, and he, also, will certainly some time belong to the French Academy. About fifteen years ago he published a short novel, *Mlle. Guignon*, which moistened the driest eyes. *Raymonde*, coming soon after, gave him a high place among contemporary writers. Since, he holds the same place, and this is not easy in an area where meet so many competitors.

Who does not know Ludovic Halévy, the bright dramatist? Long and successfully he courted the theatre and its inmates. All of a sudden, forsaking his gods, he, through "good books," went to the French Academy. Did he think that he ought to seek forgiveness for all his clever and funny, but objectionable works, when he wrote *l'Abbé Constantin*, and the short novellettes which followed this delightful and innocent little tale? If so, he will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not only be forgiven but blessed also by the lovers of pure artistic literature.

A new book of Anatole France, *Le Livre d'un Ami*, has recently followed his charming and simple tale, *Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard*. Such novels as that are like an hour's halt in the rocky path of life. The same thing must be said of Louis Ulbach's *Madame Fernel*. Among the many bright works of Hector Malot, one is a gem: *Sans Famille*. Though it is the story of a child, it is not a novel for children only. Many a grown-up man has not left the book until it was fairly ended. Some of Erckman-Chatrian's tales have often the same fate: *l'Ami Fritz*, and specially *Les deux Frères*, full of human truth and kindness. All the books of that friendly pair are pleasant and useful to read.

The death of E. About has left a blank in our literature. No one has picked up the pen which he suddenly dropped. So much sparkling wit, ready humor and feeling, are scarcely ever to be met together. *Germaine* is a masterpiece which shall live when many of those who now pretend to fame shall be buried in oblivion. *Les Mariages de Paris* and *Les Mariages de Province* will for years to come afford joy and delight to the lovers of French *esprit* and universal homely wisdom. About was, indeed, the representative of a large part of our nation, and none has ever been more thoroughly a Frenchman.

Last but not least comes Th. Bentzon. This name is a pseudonym for a talented lady, Mme. Blanc, who has written several novels full of charm. One of them, *La petite Perle*, is well named, for it is, though a little pearl, indeed a real jewel. Mme. Blanc not only graces our country, but she knows and appreciates American literature. It is through her able pen that French people who do not know English are acquainted with American novelists. Her excellent articles in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, have spread all over Europe the name of many an author, and her translations are so good that nobody yet complained of them—which must be the highest standard of perfection, as translations are generally found deficient by the author himself or by his friends.

Many a name might be added to the list, but minor celebrities may be kept aside till they grope their way to real fame. Others, like Victor Hugo, Balzac, etc., belong to a more remote period. Actual French fiction is represented fairly enough in these pages, and the reader may see that if the Naturalists are a more noisy set,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they are far less numerous than the other groups of authors. These would not like, probably, to be called Idealists, the expression having grown somewhat oldish, but they are nevertheless the faithful followers of Ideal. They prove also by their works that one may worship Ideal and be at the same time a very careful observer of real life, whose humble cares are often redeemed by some simple poetry and touching self-forgetfulness.

HENRY GRÉVILLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THERE is now pending before the New York Legislature a bill "to prevent discrimination on account of sex at municipal elections." It enacts that:

"No inspector of election or poll clerk shall hereafter refuse to register or to receive the vote of any citizen offering to register prior to or to vote at any municipal election by reason of the sex of any citizen who in other respects shall possess the qualifications required by law, and that a violation of the provisions of this act shall be a misdemeanor."

This bill was presented in the Assembly by Hon. George Z. Erwin of St. Lawrence, and in the Senate by Hon. Edmund L. Pitts of Orleans. Several of the strongest men in both parties are openly pledged to the measure, as are the presiding officers of both Houses; General Edward F. Jones, the President of the Senate, being an outspoken advocate of equal rights, while General James W. Husted, the Speaker of the Assembly, has long been a champion of the cause.

Some recent events have done much toward making women see that their practical interests are involved in the possession of the ballot. The salaries of the school teachers of New York city have been "readjusted" by the Board of Education, with the usual result of increasing the discrepancy of pay for men and women teachers doing the same work, the reductions in salaries coming almost without an exception out of the pockets of the women who are acknowledgedly better teachers than the men. It does not take an intelligent instructress who has suffered in this way very long to reflect that, if women were voters, they could control the election of the mayor, who appoints the Board of Education, and thus secure an influence in that body which would prevent such injustice in the future.

The recent report of Mr. Charles F. Peck, the labor commissioner for this State, contains the most appalling disclosures of the wretched condition of the working women of New York, always paid less than men for the same amount of skilled labor. Showing themselves, despite all their disadvantages, to be more economical and honest than men, they were condemned to an existence that is little more than a struggle for life carried on amid squalor and wretchedness in conditions that foster vice and drive virtue to despair.

Even so conservative a paper as the "New York Tribune," asks, in view of these facts, if women would not be likely to have better pay for their work if they had the protection which the ballot gives?

I ask your support of this measure.

LILLIE DEVEREUX BLAKE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II.

In the January number of the REVIEW "John H. Keyser" pointedly suggests a remedy for the evils resulting from "the accumulation of large personal fortunes." As the way "to harmonize conditions between labor and capital," he recommends "a beneficent law of limitation," making "a scale of graduated taxation upon accumulated and accumulating fortunes," and making "the sum of $300,000 the limit of a fortune." Aside from the question as to the intrinsic justice of relieving poverty by putting the burden of taxes upon wealth, the "beneficent law," suggested as a means of arresting the tendency of our age to the centralization of capital, is of peculiar interest. The suggestion totally ignores the existence of natural economic and social laws, or it assumes their complete subordination to "beneficent laws" enacted by legislatures.

It seems not to occur to the author of the suggestion that the very evils he desires to remedy may perhaps be traced to existing "beneficent laws" suggested by his predecessors! Nor does he perceive it possible that his "beneficent law" may generate unexpected evils, perpetuating the necessity for legislative doctoring. If these are natural economic and social laws, they cannot be suspended, but their operation may be mischievously disturbed by legislative attempts to improve them by amendment.

The need of the times is earnest study of these economic and social laws, that we may discover their true working, and appreciate the deformities produced by many supposed "beneficent laws," enacted by legislatures as specifics for real or imaginary evils. If, for instance, the "disparities" the writer speaks of are the natural results of those economic and social laws, it would be unreasonable to denounce them as unjust and as evils to be remedied by "beneficent" legislation. But, if an individual may not amass a fortune of many millions in a life-time without violating those natural laws; that, nevertheless, many individuals are performing this feat without crime, justifies the suspicion that some "beneficent laws," enacted by legislatures, protect their operations.

That the social problems adverted to may be solved by more "beneficent legislation" seems emphatically negatived by experience. But the more pertinent inquiry suggests itself: May not complete emancipation of our economic and industrial interests from "beneficent" State-intervention lead to such solution?

H. TEICHMUELLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED